

A N
EXPOSITION
OF THE
DOCTRINE
L. OF THE *Thompson*
Catholic CHURCH,

IN MATTERS of
CONTROVERSY.

By M. JAMES BENIGNE BOSSUET,
Counsellor to the King ; Bishop of *Meaux*, formerly of
Condem, and Preceptor to the DAUPHIN.

Faithfully translated into English.



LONDON: Printed in the Year, M.DCC.LIII.

EXPOSITION

DOCTRINE

OF THE

ARTS



COMPTON STREET

THE

ARTS

AND

MANUFACTURES

OF

THE

ARTS

AND

MANUFACTURES



A N

ADVERTISEMENT

CONCERNING

This present EDITION.



NE would have thought that the gentlemen of the pretended Reform'd Religion, in reading this treatise, should at least have acknowledged, That the Doctrine of the Church was faithfully expounded in it. The least they could have granted to a Bishop, was, that he understood his own Religion, and had spoke without disguise, in a matter, where to dissemble would be a crime. But nevertheless it has happened otherwise. This treatise, whilst a manuscript, was made use of to instruct several particular persons, and many copies of it were dispersed. Whereupon well-meaning persons of the pretended Reform'd Religion were, almost every where, heard to say, that if it were approved, it would in reality take away great difficul-

ties from the truth; but that the author durst never publish it, and if he should, he would not escape the censure of his whole communion, particularly that of *Rome*, which would not conform itself to his maxims. However, after some time, this book, thus condemned to a perpetual obscurity, appear'd usher'd in with the approbation of several Bishops; and the author, who knew very well he had only expressed in it the sentiments of the Council of *Trent*, apprehended not those censures threatned him by the Reformers.

INDEED there was no great likelihood that the Catholic Faith should be betrayed, instead of being expounded, by a Bishop, who, after having preached the Gospel all his life, without the least suspicion of his Doctrine, had been newly called to instruct a Prince, whom the greatest King in the world, and the most zealous defender of the Religion of his ancestors, causes to be educated in such a manner, that he may be one day one of its chief supports. But these gentlemen of the pretended Reformed Religion still persisted in their former opinion. They hourly expected an insurrection of the Catholics against this book, and even thunders from *Rome*.

THE occasion of this their imagination was, that the greatest part of them, who know nothing of our Doctrine but as represented to them by their Ministers unde

the most hideous ideas, knew it not again when shewn in its natural dress : So that it was no hard task to represent the author of the Exposition to them, as one who mollified the sentiments of his Religion, and sought out proper temperaments for satisfying all parties.

THERE has appeared two answers to this treatise. The author of the first would not discover his name; and till he himself be pleased to declare it, we will not reveal the secret. It is enough for us, that this work was approved by the Ministers of *Charenton*, (*M. Claude, de Langle, Daille, & Alix.*) and sent to the author of the Exposition by the late *M. Conrart*; one endowed with all that Catholics could desire in a man, excepting a better Religion. The other answer was written by *M. Noguier*, a Minister who is amongst them of great repute, and has the esteem of an able Divine. They both pretended the Exposition was contrary to the decisions of the Council of *Trent*. They both affirm, the very design of expounding its Doctrine is prohibited by the Pope; and they both take care to say, that *M. de Condom* only moderates and extenuates the Tenets of his Religion. As they represent him, one would think that *he relents every where; that he is coming over to them; that he abandons the sentiments of his own Church, and embraces those of the pretended Reform'd.* In fine, his trea-

tise agrees not with that Profession of Faith which the *Roman Church* proposes to all of her communion ; and they represent him at defiance with every article thereof.

If we believe *Anonymous*, this Prelate is come to a fair composition about *Transubstantiation* ! He is willing to content himself with such a reality of the Body of JESUS CHRIST in the Sacrament, as the pretended Reform'd themselves believe. When he treats of the Invocation of Saints, *He endeavours to mitigate and extenuate this worship of the Roman Church*, both as to her tenets and practice. With the Veneration of Saints, *he extenuates that of Images, as also the articles of Satisfaction, Sacrifice of the Mass and the Pope's authority.* As for Images, *he is ashamed of the excess to which the Doctrine, as well as the practice has been carried.* (p. 65.) *Anonymus*, who represents him as if he had changed the Council of *Trent's* expression in the article of Satisfaction, will needs have it, that *this change in the expression proceeds from an alteration which he introduces into the Doctrine.* In fine, he represents him as one who is going over to the sentiments of the new Reformation ; or, to use his own expression, *like the dove which returns to the ark, not finding where to rest his foot.*

HE not only lays to his charge particular opinions about the merits of Good Works, and the authority of the Pope, but seems
ready

ready, if we would confine ourselves to the Doctrine of the Exposition, to pass over these two articles, which so much perplex those of his communion.

THERE is nothing generally more frequently repeated in his Book, than the reproaches he casts upon the author of the Exposition, for deserting the *common Doctrine of the Roman Church*. He wishes that *all of this communion would conform themselves to the moderations in this book, and write in the same sense*. This would, says he a little after, *be a happy beginning of a Reformation, which might have much happier consequences*.

NAY more, he takes an advantage from these pretended alleviations. *These moderations of M. de Condom, says he, are so far from giving us an ill opinion of our Reformation, that they confirm us that good and moderate persons themselves condemn (at least a great deal) that we do, and by consequence in some measure acknowledge a Reformation to be useful and necessary*.

HHE should have concluded quite otherwise. For a Reformation, like theirs, which tends to a change in Doctrine, can never regard those things which are condemned already by common consent. But the pretended Reformed are willing to persuade themselves, that the *well-meaning and moderate persons of the Roman communion*, amongst which they rank *M. de Condom*, in many things abandon the sentiments of their Church, and c m

over as much as they can to the new Reformation.

THUS you see what they are made believe by this strange manner of mis-representing the Catholic Doctrine. Being accustomed to that hideous and terrible form, in which their Ministers represent it in their pulpits, they imagine those Catholics who lay it open in its natural purity, disguise and alter it: The more justly we represent it as it is, the less they are acquainted with it; and they imagine we are going over to them, when we only disabuse them of their false prepossessions.

'Tis true they use not always the same language. *Anonymus*, who accuses M. de Condom of making such considerable alterations in the Doctrine of the Church, tells us, *this Exposition has nothing new in it but a dexterous and delicate turn, and, in fine, nothing but these sort of apparent moderations, which, consisting only in some expressions, or in things of small consequence, give nobody any satisfaction, and only raise new difficulties, instead of resolving the old ones.*

So that he seems to be sorry for having represented the Exposition as a book which made an alteration in the Faith of the Church in all its principal points; not only in the expressions, but in the Doctrine.

LET him take it which way he pleases; if he continue to think a book, so truly Catholic as the Exposition, contrary to so many

many important points of the *Roman* Belief, he shews himself never to have had any thing but false ideas of its Doctrine. And if it be true, that by moderating only the expressions, or retrenching, as he says, *matters of small consequence*, the Catholic Doctrine seems to him so mollified, he will in the end find the Grounds of it were better than he imagined.

BUT the truth of the matter is, M. de *Condom* has not betrayed his conscience, nor dissembled the Faith of the Church, in which the Holy Ghost has placed him Bishop; and the pretended Reformed could not persuade themselves that a Doctrine, which already appears less strange to them, by the sole exposition of it, and yet an Exposition so plain and short, should be that Doctrine which their Ministers represented to them full of blasphemy and idolatry.

WE ought, undoubtedly, to praise God for such a disposition; for tho' it shews in those gentlemen a strange prepossession against us, yet it gives us hopes they will look upon our tenets with a more equitable mind, when once they are satisfied that the Doctrine of this treatise, which seems to them already more moderate, is the pure Doctrine of the Church. So that we are so far from being angry at them for making so great a difficulty to believe us when we propose our Faith to them, that we are obliged in charity to give them

gain

such explanations, that they may no longer doubt but that it was faithfully expounded to them. The thing shews itself, and we need but tell them how this treatise of the Exposition, which they believe is contrary *not only to the common Doctrine of the Divines of the Roman Church, but also to the words and doctrine of the Council*, is approved by the whole Church; and that after having received several marks of approbation from *Rome*, as well as other places, it has at last been approved by the Pope himself, in the most express and authentic manner that could be expected.

THIS book had no sooner appeared in public, but the good repute it had throughout *France* was testified to the author by letters from all sorts of people, Laics, Ecclesiastics, Religious and Divines, but especially from the greatest and most learned Prelates of the Church, whose testimonies he could even then have produced, had the subject been ever so little dubious or new.

BUT because the pretended Reform'd are apt to believe us in *France* to have particular thoughts and tenets, which approach nearer theirs in matters of Faith than the rest of the Church, and particularly than *Rome*, it is proper to inform them how matters were carried on there.

As soon as this treatise was come out, Cardinal *Bouillon* sent it to Cardinal *Bona*, desiring

An Advertisement.

II

ſiring him to examine it with the utmoſt rigour. Letters could no ſooner return from *Rome to Paris* but there came alſo from this learned and holy Cardinal, whoſe memory will be perpetuated in the Church with eternal benedictions, that honourable approbation of his, which you will find in the ſequel, among the reſt that we ſhall ſpeak of.

THE book was printed, the firſt time, about the end of the year 1671, and this Cardinal's anſwer is dated the 26th of *January*, 1672.

CARDINAL *Sigismond*, whoſe death the whole Church ſtill regrets, writ no leſs favourably concerning it to M. le Abbe de *Dangeau*. He tells us expreſſly, that M. de *Condom* has ſpoken very well of the Pope's authority; and whereas this Abbot had written him word that ſome ſcrupulous perſons here apprehended leſt this Exposition ſhould be looked upon at *Rome* as one of thoſe Explications of the Council prohibited by Pope *Pius IV*, he ſhews how ill grounded this ſcruple is. He adds, that he found the maſter of the Sacred Palace, the Secretary, and the Conſultors of the congregation *dell Indice*, all the Cardinals that compoſe it, and in particular the learned Cardinal *Branca*, Preſident of it, of the ſame opinion, and that they did all of them highly applaud this treatiſe of the Exposition. This letter is dated the 5th of *April*, 1672.

THE

THE reverend father *Hyacinth Libelli*, a famous Divine, whose merits and great learning raised him shortly after to the dignity of Archbishop of *Avignon*, was at that time Master of the Sacred Palace. His letter of the 26th of *April*, 1672, written to Cardinal *Sigismond*, sufficiently shews what esteem he had of this book; for he tells him, there is not so much as *the single shadow of a fault in it, and that if the author desires it should be printed at Rome, he will give all the necessary permissions, without altering the least tittle in it.*

IN effect, M. l' Abbe *Nazari*, famous for the *Journal des Sçavans*, which he writes with so much elegance and exactness, was at that time about an *Italian* version of it, which the cardinal *d' Estrées* caused to be revised, and did himself peruse some of the principal parts, that it might be entirely conformable to the original.

THE book had been already done into *English* by the late Abbot *Montague*, whose zeal and virtue is known to the whole world, and there were several testimonies that this version was well received by all the Catholics of *England*. This translation was printed in the year 1672, and in the year 1675 it was put into *Irish* and printed at *Rome* by the printers of the Congregation *de propaganda Fide*.

THE R. P. *Porter*, of the order of *St. Francis*, and Superior of *St. Isidore's* convent, author of this version, had already printed at
Rome

Rome itself a *latin* book intituled *Securis Evangelica*, wherein a great part of this treatise of the Exposition was inserted, to prove that the sentiments of the Church, being faithfully expounded, are so far from overturning the grounds of Faith, that they invincibly establish them.

IN the mean time the *Italian* version was carried on with all the exactness which a subject of that importance deserved; where one word ill rendred would have spoiled the whole work; and the R. P. *Capisucchi*, Master of the Sacred Palace, licenced it to be printed in the year 1675, as appears by his answer of the 27th of *June* the same year to M. de *Condom's* letter of thanks for it.

THIS prelate, after having heard from several parts of *Germany* how this treatise had been well approved of there, received a more ample testimony of it, in a letter of the 27th of *April*, 1673, from the Bishop and Prince of *Paderborn*, then Coadjutor and at present Bishop of *Munster*, in which that Prelate, whose name bears his elogium, says, that he had ordered this work to be turned into *latin*, that it might be made common every where, and especially in *Germany*: but the succeeding wars, or some other occupations having delayed this translation, the Bishop of *Castorie*, apostolical Vicar in the *United Provinces*, was desirous that a *latin* version, which the author himself had examined,

mined, might be made public, and accordingly it was printed at *Antwerp* in the year 1678.

SHORTLY after, in the same year, by the same Bishop's care, this treatise was again printed at *Antwerp* in *Flemish*, with the approbation of the Ordinary, and the Divines in those parts; so very profitable did this Prelate, who composes such excellent works himself, judge this to be for the instruction of his people.

THE Bishop of *Straßbourg*, who, notwithstanding the miseries of war, was no less careful of his flock, resolved, about the same time, to have this book turned into *German*, and published with a pastoral letter to all his Diocesans; and having acquainted the Pope with his design, his holiness caused him to be informed, That he knew the book long before; and that as he had heard from all parts it was the occasion of many conversions, so the translation of it could not but be advantageous to his people.

THE *Italian* version was now finished, with all the exactness and elegance possible. Monsieur l'Abbe *Nazari* dedicated it to the Cardinals of the Congregation *de propaganda Fide*, by whose order it was printed in the same year 1678, by the printers belonging to that Congregation.

CARDINAL *Bona's* letter was prefixed to this version, the copy of which was found at
Rome

Rome in the hands of his secretary, with the approbations of M. l'Abbe Ricci, Consultor of the Holy Office ; of R. P. M. Laurence Brancati de Laurea, religious of the order of St. Francis, Consultor and Qualificator of the holy Office, and Librarian of the Vatican ; and of M. l' Abbe Gradi, Consultor of the Congregation dell' Indice, and Librarian of the Vatican ; that is, by the chief men in *Rome* for piety and learning.

THIS book was presented to the Pope, as the *latin* translation had been before ; and he had the goodness to order M. l' abbe de St. Luke to write to the author, and to let him know that he was satisfied with it ; which he also repeated several times to the *French* ambassador.

THE author, who thought he had nothing more to wish for after such an approbation, gave, with a profound respect, his most humble thanks to the Pope, in a letter dated November 22, 1678 : In answer to which he received a Breve from his holiness of the fourth of January 1679, which contains such an express approbation of this book, that it can be no longer doubted, but that it contains the pure Doctrine of the Church, and of the holy See.

AFTER this approbation, I needed not to have mentioned any others ; but I was willing to shew how this book, which was threatned by the Ministers with such opposition

tion in the Church, and which they imagined was so contrary to her *common Doctrine*, has naturally, as I may say, passed thro' all the degrees of approbation, even to that of the Pope himself, which confirms all the rest.

THE gentlemen of the pretended Reformed-Religion may now see how they were imposed upon, when they were told *that a Catholic was known who writ against this Exposition of M. de Condom*, (*Anony. p. 23.*) It would certainly be a strange thing, that this good Catholic, unknown to all others of that Religion, should make the enemies of the Church his only confidants in a work which he designed against a Bishop of his own communion. But this imaginary writer makes the world stay too long, and the pretended Reform'd are too credulous if they suffer themselves hereafter to be amused by such-like promises.

THUS one of the necessary questions to be answered in vindication of the Exposition is entirely dispatch'd. We need not now go about to refute those Ministers, who held the Doctrine of the Exposition not to be that of the Church. Time and truth have so refuted their allegations, that no room is left for a reply.

M. Nöguier would first hear the Oracle of Rome speak before he would admit M. de Condom to have rightly explicated the *Catholic Faith*. *I give no credit*, says he, *to those approbations*

probations which these Bishops give in writing. Other Doctōrs want not the like approbations; and after all, the Oracle of Rome must speak in matters of Faith, (p. 41.) Anonymus was of the same mind, and both of them supposed nothing more could be said in this matter against M. de Condom, if once this Oracle had but spoken. This Oracle has now spoken; this Oracle, I say, which the whole Catholic Church has hearkened to with so much respect from the origin of Christianity; and the answer it has given, has shewn that what this Prelate has said, has nothing new or to be suspected in it; nothing, in a word, but what is received throughout the whole Church.

NAY, this question being answered, all the others are in a manner insensibly dispatcht.

M. DE Condom maintained that the Catholic Doctrine was never rightly understood by the pretended Reform'd; and that the authors of their separation had magnified the objections, to render them odious. What he said, appears now most certain, seeing it is manifest, on the one side, that the Exposition proposes to them the Catholic Faith in its purity; and, on the other, that it appeared less strange to them than they thought it was.

BUT if they find their pretended Reformers, to animate them against that Church wherein their ancestors served God, and in which

which they themselves received Baptism, were forced to fly to those calumnies which appear now unmaintainable, how can they dispense with themselves if they search not a-new? And why are they not afraid to persist in a schism, which is manifestly founded upon false principles, even in the principal points?

THEY believed, for example, they had good grounds to separate from the Church, under pretence that whilst she taught the merit of Good Works, she destroyed Free Justification and that confidence which a Christian ought to have in JESUS CHRIST alone. Their breach was chiefly founded upon this article. *Anonymus* thinks it enough to say, that *the article concerning Justification is one of the chief that gave occasion to the Reformation* (p. 86.) But M. *Naguier* speaks more plainly: *Those, says he, who were the authors of our Reformation had reason to propose the article of Justification, as the most principal of the rest, and the most essential foundation of their separation* (p. 83.) Now then, seeing M. *de Condom* tells them with the whole Church, that *she believes we cannot have life but in JESUS CHRIST, in whom alone she puts all her hope: That she asks all things, hopes all things, and gives thanks for all things thro' our Lord JESUS CHRIST; and, in fine, that she places all the hopes of salvation in him: What would they have more? The Church tells us, That all our sins are pardoned by pure mercy*

mercy, thro' JESUS CHRIST; that we owe that justice which is in us, by the Holy Ghost, to his free, undeserved liberality; and that all the Good Works we do, are so many gifts of his Grace. The author of this Exposition, who teaches this Doctrine, does not teach it as his own; God forbid. He teaches it as the clear and manifest Doctrine of the Council of Trent; and the Pope approves his book. After this shall it be again said, that the Council of Trent and the Roman Church overthrow Free Justification and that trust which the faithful ought to repose in JESUS CHRIST alone? Is not this unsufferable? And if we should be silent, would not the stones cry aloud and proclaim us injur'd?

It must be also granted, as it was observed in the Exposition, that those disputes which the pretended Reform'd have raised upon so capital a point, are almost brought to nothing, not to say wholly refuted. No body will doubt of it, if they consider what *Anonymus* has writ concerning the merit of Good Works, with the approbation of four Ministers of *Charenton*. *We faithfully acknowledge*, says he, *that M. de Condom, and those of the Roman Church, who hold the most orthodox opinions concerning Grace, express themselves almost in all things as we do. We agree with them in the main.* (p. 104.) But since he promised us so much sincerity, he ought to have acknowledged that *M. de Condom*, whom

whom he makes here to be of a particular Sect, has not said one word concerning the merit of Good Works, but what is taken from the Council. He said, *that eternal life ought to be proposed to the children of God, both as a grace which is mercifully promised to them by the means of our Saviour JESUS CHRIST, and as a recompence which is faithfully rendred to their good works and merits, by virtue of that promise.* He said, *that merits are gifts of God.* He said, *We can do nothing of ourselves; but that we can do all things with him who strengthens us, and that our whole confidence is in JESUS CHRIST:* And the rest, which you may see in their proper place. By this means it is he has satisfied the pretended Reformed, and made them say, they agree with him in *the main.* Seeing therefore these propositions are taken word for word from the Council, they can no longer refuse to acknowledge, that the *principal* subject of their complaints is taken away by the sole proposing the decrees and proper terms of a Council so much hated and blamed amongst them.

WHAT is it offends them most in the satisfactions which the Church exacts of the faithful, but only that they think Catholics look upon those of JESUS CHRIST as insufficient? Will they deny that their catechisms and confessions of Faith are grounded upon this foundation? What will they now say, when the author of the Exposition tells them,

them, with the whole Church, That JESUS CHRIST, God and man, was solely capable, by the infinite dignity of his person, to offer up to God a sufficient satisfaction for our sins: That this satisfaction is infinite; that our Saviour has payed the entire price of our redemption; that nothing is wanting to this price, seeing it is infinite; and that the punishments reserv'd, suffered in penance, come not from any defect in the payment, but from a certain order, which he has established to restrain us, by just fears and by a saving discipline? These and all those other expressions which make *Anonymus* say this author *extenuates* the Doctrine of Satisfaction and *returns like the dove to the ark*, are the pure Doctrines of the Church, and of the Council of *Trent*, acknowledged for such by the Pope himself. Why therefore will they make people believe that the Church looks upon that as an aid to the satisfaction of JESUS CHRIST, which she proposes as a means only to apply it? And with what security of conscience could the pretended Reformed, upon such false suppositions, violate that holy unity which JESUS CHRIST has so much recommended to his Church?

THEY look upon our Sacrifice of the Altar with horror, as if JESUS CHRIST were again put to death upon it. What has the author of the Exposition done to diminish this unjust horror, but only represented the Doctrine of the Church faithfully to them? He has told them

them that this Sacrifice is of such a nature, as it admits only a mystical and spiritual death of our adorable victim, who remains always impassible and immortal; and is so far from diminishing the infinite perfection of the Sacrifice of the Cross, *It is established only to celebrate the remembrance of it, and to apply the virtue thereof.* Anonymus assures us, upon this account, that M. de Condom extenuates the doctrine of the Catholic Church: And M. Noguier also assures us, he has not exposed the truth, (p. 286.) And yet he has only followed the doctrine of the Council, whose proper terms he has made use of; and the whole Church approves his Exposition. Who does not therefore perceive how this Doctrine appears to the pretended Reformed more moderate and agreeable, only because they do not find those Monsters in it which they imagined to themselves?

ANONYMUS himself tells us, *The article of Invocation of Saints is one of the most essential in Religion,* (p. 61.) It is also one of those wherein M. de Condom seems to him chiefly to moderate the doctrine of his Church; for he accuses him of it no less than three times. But what has M. de Condom said? The same the catechism of the Council of Trent said; the same the Council itself and the Confession of Faith drawn from it has said; and the same which all Catholics say. *That the Saints offer their prayers for us,* is what the Confession

feſſion of Faith ſays : *That they offer them by JESUS CHRIST, is what the Council ſays : In a word, That we pray to them with the ſame mind we pray to our brethren who are upon earth, to pray with us, and for us, to our common maſter, in the name of our common mediator who is JESUS CHRIST.* Behold what M. de Condom has extracted out of the Council, out of the Catechiſm and out of all the public acts of the Catholic Church; and this is the reaſon his Doctrine has been ſo well approved.

THIS answer is ſufficient to overthrow the very grounds of that horror which the pretended Reformed have conceived againſt our doctrine.

THEIR Catechiſm accuses us of *Idolatry, becauſe by that recourſe we have to Saints, we place one part of our truſt in them, and give to them what God has reſerved to himſelf.* (Cat. Dem. p. 34.)

BUT, on the contrary, it appears that when we pray to Saints, we pray to them only to pray for us ; a kind of prayer, which, by its own nature, is ſo far from being reſerved to God by himſelf, that it can never be addreſſed to him, who is the independent being. And if this form of prayer, *pray for us*, dimin iſhes the truſt we have in God, it would be no leſs condemnab le to uſe it to the living than to the dead ; and St. Paul would not have ſaid ſo often, *Brethren pray for us.*
(1 Theſſ.

(1 *Theff.* 5. 25. 2. 3. 1. *Heb.* 13. 18.) The whole Scripture is full of prayers of this nature.

BUT, says their Confession of Faith, (Conf. Art. 24.) this is overthrowing the mediation of JESUS CHRIST, *who commands us to retire in private, and pray to his father in his name.* How can any one imagine this, seeing neither the Saints, who are in Heaven, nor the faithful upon earth, make intercessions by and thro' themselves, or in their own names, but only in the name of JESUS CHRIST; as all Catholics teach with the Council?

THUS the Catholic Church has only to declare, as she does, that her intention never was to demand any thing of the Saints but their humble prayers in the name of JESUS CHRIST, of like nature with those the faithful offer up for one another upon earth: These few words will eternally convince the pretended Reformed of having borne her a most unjust hatred,

BUT M. *Noguer* declares, *Let M. de Condom say what he will, he will never be persuaded the Roman Church has no other intention, when she tells us it is profitable to invoke the Saints, but that we should ask them the assistance of their prayers as we do those of the faithful who live amongst us, (p. 54.)* But what will he say, now he sees the Roman Church so visibly approves what M. de Condom had, in effect, only gathered from the

the universal belief of those in communion with her? *But why then,* adds M. Noguier, *do Catholics ask not only the prayers but the aid, protection and succour of the blessed Virgin, and of the Saints?* (p. 57.) As if that were not a kind of aid, succour and protection, to recommend the miserable to him who alone can comfort them. Such is the protection we may receive from the blessed Virgin and the Saints. It is not a small succour to be aided by their prayers; seeing they are at the same time so humble, so pleasing and so efficacious. But why should we argue about words, where the thing is so evident? The Exposition produces to these Ministers most certain testimonies, by which it is manifest, *that in what terms soever the prayers we offer to the Saints be couched, the intention of the Church, and of her faithful always reduces them to this form, PRAY FOR US.* No matter for that, the Ministers will never believe it. They must then raze out of their Catechism and their Confession of Faith those accusations of Idolatry, which they are full of; they must retrench from their sermons so many bloody invectives, which have no other grounds; and this they cannot resolve of: And let us make what declarations we can of our sentiments, they will neither believe the Council, nor it's Catechism; nor our Confession of Faith, nor the Bishops, nor the Pope himself.

It is not necessary to repeat here what is said in the Exposition to other objections, and principally to that where they accuse the Church of attributing to Saints a divine knowledge and power, whilst she teaches they can neither know nor do any thing of themselves.

BUT the accusation of Idolatry has another foundation, which they accuse M. de Condom of having extenuated as well as the others; and it is the article concerning Images, where nevertheless he has sought for no other palliations than having faithfully exposed the meaning of the Church.

THERE needs no more than this to make the very suspicion of Idolatry vanish, according to the principles of the pretended Reformed; and they need only, in this, compare the Doctrine of their own Catechism with that of the Council of Trent, represented in the Exposition.

THEIR Catechism upon this Commandment, *Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven Image*, asks whether God forbids the making of any Image? And the answer is, *No, but that God forbids only the making of any Image whereby to represent God, or to adore it.* (Dem. 23.) Behold the two things which they think forbidden in this precept of the Decalogue.

PERHAPS they will do us the justice to believe that we don't pretend to represent God; and

and that, if they see in some pictures God the Father painted in that form wherein he was pleased so often to appear to his Prophets, we pretend no more to derogate from his invisible and spiritual nature, than he himself, when he exhibited himself under that form. The Council explains sufficiently to them, upon this account, *that we pretend not thereby to represent or express the Divinity, or to give it any colours*; (Sess. 25.) and I think I should do them an injury in proceeding to a clearer proof.

LET us pass therefore to the second part of their Doctrine, and let us learn from their Catechisms *what form of adoration is condemned*. It is, says the answer, *to prostrate one's self before an Image, to pray to it, to bow the knee before it, or shew some other sign of reverence, as if God exhibited himself there to us*. This is, in effect, the error of the Gentiles, and the proper character of Idolatry. But they who believe, with the Council, *That Images have neither divinity nor virtue in them, for which they ought to be revered*, and who place all their benefit in their recalling the originals to our remembrance, don't believe that God in them *exhibits himself to us*. It is not therefore Idolatry, by the consent of the pretended Reformed, and according to the proper definition of their Catechism.

ANONYMUS seems to have been sensible of this truth in that place, where objecting
 B 2 this

this commandment of the Decalogue, he says, that God *forbids to make Images and to worship them.* (p. 67.) He is in the right. The words of the precept are express, and the Images there spoken of are those which are forbidden to *be made* as well as to be *worshipped*: That is, according to the explication of his Catechism, *those which are made to represent God, and those which are made to shew him present*; and which are worshipped with the same intention as full of his divinity. We neither make nor suffer any of this nature. We worship not Images; God forbid: But we make use of Images, to put us in mind of the originals. Our Council, so odious to the pretended Reformed Church, teaches us no other use of them. Is this then enough to say, as that Church doth in her own Confession of Faith, (Art. 28.) *that all sorts of Idolatry are in vogue in the Roman Church?* Is it for this that her discipline calls us *Idolaters*, and our Religion *Idolatry*? (Disc. Art. 11. 13. Art. 5. 2.) Without doubt they represent to themselves other things than our Doctrine, when they give us the name of Gentiles: They believe we follow their abominable errors, and that we believe, as they did, that God shews himself to us in those Images.

HAD it not been for these mortal prejudices, and these horrid ideas, which they frame to themselves of the sentiments of the Church, Christians

Christians could never have imagined it so detestable a crime to kiss the cross, in remembrance of him who bore our iniquities upon the wood, nor that so simple and natural a manifestation of those sentiments of tenderness, which that pious object excites in our hearts, ought to make us regarded as if we adored *Baal*, or the Golden Calves of *Samaria*.

DURING this strange prepossession of the pretended Reformed, this treatise of the Exposition might well appear to them, which really it did, a book full of artifice, which did nothing but moderate and extenuate the sentiments of Catholics. But now, when they see clearly that all the artifice of this book is to separate the Doctrines which they have imputed to the Church from those which she professes, that all the mitigation he makes in Doctrine is, that he has taken off that hideous mask which the Ministers had put upon it; let them confess that this Church was unworthy of so much horror as they had for her, and that at least she deserves to be heard.

NEITHER the Pope, nor the holy See, ought to be any longer accused of diminishing that adoration which is due to God, nor that confidence which a Christian ought to establish in his sole goodness thro' our Lord JESUS CHRIST; since they see, without

out further search, this treatise of the Exposition, which is made only to explicate these two truths, has received at *Rome*, and from the Pope himself, so authentic an approbation.

AFTER this they will certainly be ashamed of that title which they give the Pope. No one can think of it without horror; nor hear, without astonishment, that the pretended Reformed, who boast of following the Scripture word for word, (when the Apostle St. John, who has alone named Antichrist, tells us, three or four times, that *Antichrist is he who denies that JESUS CHRIST is come in the flesh*, 2 John 1. 7. 1 John 2. 22. 4. 3.) dare so much as think that he, who teaches so fully the mystery of JESUS CHRIST, that is to say, his Divinity, his Incarnation, the superabundance of his merits, the necessity of his grace, and that absolute confidence we must have in it, should nevertheless be that Antichrist described by the Apostle.

BUT it is objected against the Popes, that they are that wicked person, and that man of iniquity who has seated himself in the temple of God; and makes himself be adored as God; (2. Thess. 2. 4.) they who confess themselves not only mortal men, but sinners; who pray every day with the rest of the faithful, *Forgive us our offences*; and who never approach to the Altar without confessing their sins, and saying, in the most essential part of the

the

the holy Sacrifice, that they hope for eternal life, *not by their own merits, but thro' the bounty of God, in the name of our Lord JESUS CHRIST.*

'TIS true, they maintain that primacy which JESUS CHRIST has given them in the person of *St. Peter* ; but it is there by That they advance the work of JESUS CHRIST himself, the work of charity and concord, which would never have been perfectly accomplished, if the universal Church and the whole *Episcopal Order* had not one Head of ecclesiastical government upon earth, to make the members act in concurrence, and accomplish in the whole Body the mystery of unity, so much recommended by the Son of God. It is saying nothing, to answer, that the Church has her true Head in Heaven, who unites her by animating her with his holy Spirit. Who doubts of it ! But who knows not that this holy Spirit, who disposes all things with as much sweetness as efficacy, knows also how to prepare exterior means proportionable to his designs ? The Holy Ghost both teaches and governs us interiorly ; therefore he establishes pastors and teachers to act exteriorly. The Holy Ghost unites the Body of the Church, and the ecclesiastical government ; therefore it is he places at the head a common father, and a principal disposer, who may govern the whole family of JESUS CHRIST,

CHRIST. We will here call to witness the consciences of those of the pretended Reformed Religion. In this unfortunate age, when so many wicked sects endeavour, by little and little, to undermine the foundations of Christianity, and believe it enough only to name JESUS CHRIST to introduce indifferency in Religion, and manifest impiety into the bosom of the Church, Who sees not the necessity of a Pastor who may watch over his flock, and, authorized from above, excite all others whose vigilance might slacken? Let them tell us, sincerely, if it be not the Socinians, the Anabaptists, the Independents; those who, under the name of Christian liberty, would establish indifferency in Religions, and so many other pernicious sects which they condemn as well as we, who fly with the greatest impetuosity against St. *Peter's* chair, and cry loudest that his authority is tyrannical? I don't wonder at it: Those who would divide the Church, or surprize her, fear nothing more than to see her march against them, like a well ranged army, under one Head. Let us not raise a quarrel with any; let us only reflect whence come those books wherein these dangerous licences and antichristian Doctrines are taught: At least none can deny but the See of *Rome*, by the very constitution of it, is incompatible with all these novelties; and if we could not know
by

by the Gospel that the primacy of this See is necessary for us, experience itself would convince us of it. Moreover, we must not be astonished if this author of the Exposition, who places the essential authority of this See in those things wherein all Catholic schools agree, hath been approved without difficulty. The chair of St. *Peter* stands in need of no disputing; what all Catholics acknowledge, without contestation, suffices to maintain that power which was given to it for edification, and not for destruction. The pretended Reformed should no longer give way to those vain phantoms with which they are frightened. What does it profit them to search in histories for the vices of Popes? When, if what they meet with there should be true, does the vices of men destroy the institution of JESUS CHRIST and the privilege of St. *Peter*? Shall the Church rise in rebellion against a power which maintains her unity, under pretence that some have abused it? Christians are accustomed to reason upon higher and truer principles, and know that God is able to maintain his works in the midst of all the evils which accompany human frailty.

WE then entreat the gentlemen of the pretended Reformed Religion, by that charity, which is God himself; by the name of Christian, which is common to us both, not to judge of the doctrine of our Church
by

by what they hear in their sermons, or read in their books; where, many times, the heat of dispute and prevention; not to mention any other, make things frequently otherwise represented than they are; but to hearken to this Exposition of the Catholic Doctrine. It is a work, in reality, which consists not so much in disputing as in explicating clearly our Belief; in which to see how plainly the author has proceeded, we need only consider his design.

HE promised in the very beginning,

1. To propose the true tenets of the Catholic Church, and *to distinguish them from those which are falsely imputed to her.*

2. THAT none should doubt that he faithfully proposed the true sentiments of the Church, he promised to take them *from the Council of Trent, where the Church has spoken decisively upon the points in question.*

3. HE promised to propose to the gentlemen of the pretended Reformed Religion, not all points in general, but *those which caused the greatest separation betwixt them and us, and, to speak properly, those which they made the occasion of their breach.*

4. HE promised that what he said, to make the decisions of the Council more intelligible, *should be approved of in the Church, and manifestly conformable to the Doctrine of the same Council.*

ALL

ALL this is plain and just. And, in the first place, no body can think it strange we should distinguish the Church's tenets from those which are falsely imputed to her. When persons are animated beyond measure, for want of a right understanding, and when strange prejudices move great disputes, there is nothing more natural, nothing more charitable, than to explicate matters clearly. The holy fathers practised a way fraudless and calm, like this, to set men right again: Whilst the Arians and Semi-Arians decry'd the symbol of Nice and the consubstantiality of the Son, by the false ideas they fix'd upon them, St. *Athenasius* and St. *Hilarius*, the two most illustrious defenders of the *Nicene* faith, represented to them the true sense of the Councils; and St. *Hilary* said to them, *Let us both together condemn false interpretations, but not destroy the certainty of faith—The word Consubstantial may be misunderstood; let us resolve how we may rightly understand it—We may lay down the true state of faith betwixt us, if we do not overthrow what has been rightly established, but remove misunderstanding.* (St. *Hil.* lib. de Synod.)

It is Charity itself which dictates such words, and suggests such means to reunite our minds. We may say the same to the gentlemen of the pretended Reform'd Religion: If the merit of Good Works—if prayers

prayers addressed to Saints—if the Eucharist—if the humble satisfactions of Penitents, who endeavour to appease the wrath of God in voluntarily revenging upon themselves, by laborious exercises, his offended Justice—if the terms we use of a tradition which claims its origin from the first ages, for want of being rightly understood, offend you, the author of the Exposition offers himself to give you the plain and natural explication of them, which the Church has always faithfully preserv'd. He says nothing of his own, he acknowledges not particular authors; and that he may not be suspected of changing the tenets of the Church, he uses the very expressions of the Council of *Trent*, where she has explicated herself upon these matters in question. What can there be more rational?

THIS was the second thing he promised, and he has in this only followed the example of the pretended Reformed. These gentlemen complain, as well as we, their Doctrines are not rightly understood; and the means they propose to come to a true knowledge of them, is not different from that which M. de Condom makes use of. Their synod of *Dort* requires that none judge of the faith of their Churches from calumnies picked up here and there, or passages of particular authors, which are often falsely cited, or wrested to a sense contrary to their intentions; but from the Confessions of faith of their Churches, and from the declarations

declarations of their orthodox Doctrine, unanimously made in this synod. (Conclus. Syn. in Confess. Fid. Ed. Gen. p. 2.)

THE faith then of a Church must be learnt from its public definitions, and not from private authors, who may be falsely quoted, misunderstood, and may also themselves misexplicate the sentiments of their Religion. Upon which account it will be only necessary, that, to expound ours to the pretended Reformed, we produce the decisions of the Council of *Trent*.

I KNOW the very name of this Council offends those gentlemen, and *Anonymus* often shews his ill humour against it. But what do his invectives avail him? We go not here about to justify the Council: It suffices this author of the Exposition, that the Doctrine of this Council is universally received in the Catholic Church, without contestation; and that she admits of no other decisions, in these matters of controversy, but of this Council.

THE pretended Reformed have always endeavoured to have these decisions thought ambiguous, and *Anonymus* reproaches us also with their being capable of a *double or triple sense*. (p. 11. 12.) Those who have not read this Council, unless it were in the invectives of their Ministers, and in the history of *Fa. Paul*, its declared enemy, believe them such: But one word will satisfy them. It is very true;

true, there were some points the Council would not decide, and they were those concerning which there was no settled tradition, and which were disputed of in the schools; it was but reasonable they should be left undecided: But for those it has decided, it has spoken so precisely, that amongst so many decrees of this Council produced in the Exposition, *Anonymus* could not find so much as one in which there was this double or triple sense he objects against us. Indeed it is but reading them, and one shall see that they have no ambiguity, and that it is impossible for men to explicate themselves more clearly.

WE may put the Exposition itself to the same test, and judge thereby whether *Anonymus* had reason to upbraid the author of this Exposition with *those rambling and general terms, in which, says he, he entangles the most difficult matters.* (p. 25. Rep. p. 12.)

THE third thing the author of the Exposition promised, was to treat those matters *which gave occasion to the separation.* This is precisely what ought to be done. There is none but knows that in disputes there are always some certain principal points upon which mens minds are fixed. It is to these a person must apply himself, who would make it his business to end or appease those contests. Thus did the author of the Exposition, who, in the very beginning, declared

clared to the pretended Reformed, that he would expound to them those points *from which they took the subject of their separation.* And to shew it was a deliberate expression, he again declares the same at the latter end, *that to keep himself fixed to what is principal, he omitted some questions which the gentlemen of the pretended Reformed Religion did not look upon as a lawful subject of separation.*

He has kept his word most faithfully, and the titles alone of the Exposition will shew, that he has omitted none of those principal articles.

So that *Anonymus* should not have accused M. de Condom of having some select terms to avoid the difficulties which give him the most trouble; of leaving many questions untouched, and making haste to that of the Eucharist, where he thought he could enlarge himself with less disadvantage. (p. 22. Rep. p. 168.)

WHAT an idea would he give us of this book of the Exposition! But it destroys itself. Every one sees it was M. de Condom's business to enlarge himself upon that point of the Eucharist; not because he thought he could do it *with less disadvantage*, but because this point is in reality the most difficult and fullest of great questions. So that it will appear he has treated these matters with less or greater scope, according as they appear'd less or more embroiling, not to himself, but to those for whom he writes. And
if

if it be true that *he* lays aside those difficulties which give him the most trouble, it must be allowed those which give him the least are in reality those which are the most essential, and those in which the pretended Reformed always thought themselves the most secure. He has treated of the worship due to God, of prayers to Saints, of the honour we render to them, as also of their images and relics. He has spoken of justifying Grace; of the merit of Good Works; of the necessity of Satisfactory Works; of Purgatory, and Indulgences; of sacramental Confession and Absolution; of the Real Presence of the body and blood of our Saviour in the Eucharist; of that adoration which is therein due to him; of Transubstantiation, and the Sacrifice of the Altar; of Communion under one species; of the authority of Tradition, and that of the Church; of the divine institution of the Pope's Primacy, where he has, in one word, explained what is to be believed of episcopacy. He has expounded all these difficulties, and there needs only a little honesty to grant he has been so far from avoiding difficulties, as *Anonymus* would have it thought; that he has principally applied himself to those which the pretended Reformed find the greatest. *Anonymus* himself tells us, that the invocation of Saints is one of the most essential articles of Religion; and at the same time he adds, this is

one of those upon which *M. de Condom* has been most prolix. (p. 61.) What points are more exactly treated in the Exposition than those of the Eucharist and the Sacrifice, that of Images, of merit of Good Works, and of Satisfaction? And is it not in these the pretended Reformed find the greatest difficulties? In fine, we will ask even themselves, whether it be not true, that if they were satisfied in all those points treated of in the Exposition, they would not any longer hesitate to embrace the faith of the Church? It is therefore certain, the author has treated of all those capital points, upon which both of us agree the greatest difficulties move: Nay more, he has always fixed himself to the principal knot of the difficulty, seeing he applies himself chiefly, according to his first promise, to those parts where the Catholic Doctrine is accused to strike at the foundations of faith and christian piety. It is not therefore to avoid difficulties he has left some questions untouched, which are but consequences and fuller explications of those which he has handled; or, at least, are such as disturb no body; but, on the contrary, he has done it that he might apply himself with less distraction to the chief difficulties upon which depend the decision of our controversies.

THE author of the Exposition has been no less faithful in performance of his fourth promise, which was to affirm nothing to
make

make the Council to be better understood, but what was manifestly conformable to it, and approved of in the Church.

ANONYMUS looks upon these words, and the whole design of the Exposition, as a testimony which shews that *the Doctrine of the Roman Church, tho' explained so clearly, and decided in the Council of Trent, is not yet so clear, but that it needs an explication.* (Rep. p. 11.)

M. Noguier seems also to draw the same Consequence, and they have both of them looked upon the Exposition as an explication which the obscurity of the Council stood in need of. (p. 39, 40.)

BUT we know that it is not always the obscurity of a decision, especially in matters of faith, which makes it be taken in a wrong sense; it is the prepossession of mind, the ardour of dispute, the heat of persons engaged, which makes them not understand one another, and often attribute to an adversary what he believes the least. So that when the author of the Exposition proposes the decisions of the Council of *Trent* to the pretended Reformed, and adds what may be useful to remove those impressions which hinder them from understanding them aright, they ought not to conclude from thence that the decisions are ambiguous; but only that nothing is so well digested, nor so clear, but may be understood amiss, when prejudice and passion interpose.

To

To what purpose then do M. *Noguer* and *Anonymus* object to the author of the Exposition the Bull of Pope *Pius IV.* The design of the Exposition has nothing of those glosses and commentaries, which with great reason this Pope condemned. For what did those commentators and glossers, especially those who have writ glosses upon the laws? What did they, for the most part, but fill the margins with their own imaginations, which most commonly serve only to confound the text, and which notwithstanding they give for the text itself? Let us add, that, for the preservation of unity, this Pope was obliged not to permit every Doctor to propose decisions upon doubts, which succeeding time and vain subtilties might give birth to. Nor has any thing of this nature been done in the Exposition. It is one thing to interpret what is obscure and doubtful; another to propose what is clear, and to make use of it to remove false impressions. The last is what the author of the Exposition has endeavour'd precisely to do. And if he has added some of his own reflections to the decisions of this Council, to make them more intelligible to those people who would never look upon them without prejudice, it is because their prepossession had need of such an assistance. But why should we speak any longer upon a thing which is now clear enough? We have, in few words, given a certain method to enlighten

ten the understandings of those who are the most zealous to maintain this ambiguity of the Council. They need only read in this Exposition its Decrees, which are there produced, and convince themselves by their own eyes.

THE most important thing here is, that the author of the Exposition was not deceived when he promised what he would say, for the better understanding of this Council, should be manifestly of the same Spirit, and approved of in the Church. The matter is in itself clear, and the following approbations will make it apparent.

It must therefore be no longer suppos'd that the sentiments explained in this work are the *qualifying or extenuating thoughts* of one man, but the common Doctrine which we see is, for this reason, universally approved. It will not therefore avail M. Noguier nor *Anonymus* any thing, after this, either to object to us those practices which they call general, or the particular opinion of Divines. For without examining these unnecessary things, it suffices in one word to say, that those Practices and opinions, be they what they will, which are not found conformable to the intent and decisions of the Council, are nothing to Religion, nor to the body of the Catholic Church; and can't, consequently, as the pretended Reform'd themselves avouch, give the least pretence to separate
from

from us ; because no person is obliged either to approve or follow them. (*Daille* apol. c. 6.)

BUT, say they, those abuses ought to be suppressed ; as if one of the ways to suppress them were not to shew the truth in its purity, without prejudice to the other means, with which prudence and zeal may inspire the Bishops. As for the remedy of Schism practised by the pretended Reformers, if it were not detestable in itself, the miseries which it has caused, and still causes throughout Christendom, would give us a horror of it.

I WILL not here reproach the pretended Reformed with the abuses which are amongst them. This work of Charity does not permit such like recriminations. It suffices I advertise them that to attack us in reality, they must combat, not those abuses which we condemn as well as they, but the Doctrines which we maintain. But if, in examining them more narrowly, they find, they give not scope enough to their invectives, they ought at least to acknowledge we have reason to tell them the Faith which we profess is less worthy of blame than they believed it was.

IT remains at present, that we beg of God to grant they may read a work without bitterness, which is published only to instruct them. The success is in his hands, who alone can touch the heart. He knows the limits he has fixt to the progress of error,

ror, and the miseries of his afflicted Church, by the loss of so great a number of her children. But we cannot hinder ourselves from hoping some great effects towards the reunion of Christians, under a Pope, who exercises so piously, and with so perfect a zeal, free from Interest, the most holy function in the world; and under a King, who prefers to all the conquests that have enlarged his kingdom, those that might gain him his own subjects to the Church.



AN
EXPOSITION
 OF THE
Doctrine of the Church,
 In MATTERS of
CONTROVERSY.

SECT. I.

The Design of this Treatise.



AFTER more than an age
 of contests with the gentle-
 men of the pretended Re-
 formed Religion, matters,
 from whence they took the
 ground of their separation,
 ought to be sufficiently clear-
 ed, and their minds disposed to a right
 conception of the sentiments of the Catholic
 Church. So that to me nothing seems more
 proper, than to propose her Tenets plainly,
 and to distinguish them rightly from those
 which

48 *The Design of this Treatise.*

which have been fallſly imputed to her. Indeed I have, upon ſeveral occaſions, taken notice, that the averſion which theſe gentlemen have to moſt of our ſentiments, is grounded upon ſome falſe *ideas*, which they have formed to themſelves, concerning them; and often upon ſome certain words, which are ſo offenſive to them, that they immediately ſtop there, and never come ſo far as to conſider the grounds of things. Upon which account, I thought nothing could be more beneficial than to explicate to them what the Church has defined in the Council of *Trent*, concerning thoſe points which keep them fartheſt from us; without meddling with that which they are accuſtomed to object either againſt particular Doctors, or againſt thoſe tenets which are neither neceſſarily nor univerſally received. For all parties agree, and M. *Daille* himſelf is of this opinion, that it is a very unreaſonable thing to attribute the ſentiments of particular perſons to a whole body; (Apol. c. 6.) and he adds, that no ſeparation ought to be but upon the account of articles authentically eſtabliſhed, to the belief and obſervance of which all perſons are obliged. I will not meddle then with any thing but the decrees of the Council of *Trent*; becauſe in them the Church has given her deciſion upon theſe matters now in agitation: And what I ſhall ſay, for the better underſtanding of thoſe deciſions, ſhall be

be what is approved of in the Church, and shall manifestly appear conformable to the Doctrine of this Council.

THIS Exposition of our Doctrine will produce two good effects. The *first*, that many disputes will wholly vanish; because it will appear they are only grounded upon some erroneous explications of our belief. The *second*, that those disputes which remain, will not appear, according to the principles of the pretended Reformed, so capital, as at first they endeavoured to represent them; and that, according to the same principles, they contain nothing any ways injurious to the grounds of Faith.

S E C T. II.

Those of the pretended Reformed Religion acknowledge, That the Catholic Church embraces all the fundamental articles of the Christian Religion.

AND to begin with the fundamental and principal articles of Faith; these gentlemen of the pretended Reformed Religion must of necessity acknowledge they are believed and professed in the Catholic Church.

IF they will have them to consist in believing we must adore one only God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and that we must

50 *The Reformed acknowledge*

must put our trust in God alone, thro' his Son, who became man, was crucified, and rose again for us: They know in their consciences we profess this Doctrine; and if they add those other articles which are comprehended in the Apostles Creed, they do not doubt also but we receive them all, without exception, and have a pure and true knowledge of them.

M. DAILLE has writ a treatise, entitled *Faith founded upon Scripture*, wherein, after having exposed all the articles of Faith held by the pretended Reformed Churches, he tells us, *they are beyond all contestation; that the Roman Church professes to believe them; that in reality they do not hold all our opinions, but that we hold all their articles of Faith.* (Part. 3. c. 1.)

THIS Minister then cannot deny, unless he destroy his own Faith, but that we believe all the principal articles of the Christian Religion.

BUT, tho' M. Daille had not granted thus much, the thing is manifest in itself, and all the world knows, that we believe all those articles which Protestants call fundamental; so that sincerity itself requires that they should grant us, indisputably, that we have not really rejected any of them.

THE pretended Reformed, who see the advantages we may draw from this acknowledgment, are desirous to deprive us of them.

Catholics hold all fundamentals. 51

by saying that we destroy those articles, by interposing others contrary to them. This is what they endeavour to persuade by consequences drawn from our Doctrine; but the same M. *Daille*, whose authority I acknowledge once more, not so much to convince them by the testimony of one of their most learned Ministers, as because what he says is in itself evident, tells them what they ought to think of such kind of consequences, supposing ill ones might be drawn from our Doctrine. See what he writes to M. *Monglat*, upon account of his apology. *Altho' the opinion of the Lutherans, upon the Eucharist, as well as that of Rome, according to us, infers the destruction of the Humanity of JESUS CHRIST, yet this consequence can't be attributed to them without calumny, seeing they formally reject it.*

THERE is nothing more essential to the Christian Religion, than the reality of the Human Nature in JESUS CHRIST; and yet tho' the *Lutherans* hold a Doctrine, from whence is inferred the destruction of this capital verity, by consequences, which the pretended Reformed judge evident; yet they have not scrupled to offer to communicate with them; because their opinion *has no poison in it*, as M. *Daille* tells us in his apology; (Cap. 7.) and their national Synod, held at *Charonton*, 1631, admits them to the
Holy

52 *The Reformed acknowledge, &c.*

Holy Table, upon this ground, *that they agree in the principal and fundamental points of Religion.* It is then a certain maxim established amongst them, that they must not in these cases look upon the consequences which may be drawn from a Doctrine, but purely upon what he proposes and acknowledges who teaches it.

So that when they infer by consequences, which they pretend to draw from our Doctrine, that we do not sufficiently acknowledge that sovereign glory which is due to God, nor the quality of Saviour and Mediator in JESUS CHRIST, nor the infinite value of his Sacrifice, nor the superabundant plenitude of his Merits; we may defend ourselves, without difficulty, from such consequences, by this short answer of M. *Daille*, and tell them that the Catholic Church disavowing them, they cannot be imputed to her *without calumny*.

BUT I will go yet further, and shew these gentlemen of the pretended Reformed Religion, by the sole Exposition of our Doctrine, that the Catholic Church is so far from overthrowing the fundamental articles of Faith, either directly or indirectly, that, on the contrary, she establishes them after so solid and evident a manner, that no one can question her right understanding of them, without great injustice.

SECT.

Religious Worship is terminated in God alone.

TO begin with that adoration which is due to God alone; the Catholic Church teaches us, that it consists principally in believing he is the Creator and Lord of all things, and in adhering to him with all the powers of our Soul, by Faith, Hope and Charity, as to him alone who can render us happy, by the communication of an infinite good, which is himself.

THIS interior adoration, which we render to God in spirit and truth, has its exterior marks; whereof the principal is Sacrifice, which cannot be offered to any but to God alone; because a Sacrifice is established to make a public acknowledgment, and a solemn protestation of God's sovereignty, and our absolute dependance.

THE same Church teaches us, that all *religious worship* ought to terminate in God, as its necessary end; and that if the honour which she renders to the blessed Virgin, and to the Saints, may, in some sense, be called *religious*, it is for its necessary relation to God.

BUT before we explicate any further in what this honour consists, it will not be un-
useful to take notice, how the gentlemen of the pretended Reformation, obliged by the strength of truth, begin to acknowledge the
custom

custom of praying to Saints and honouring their Relics was established even in the fourth age of the Church. Monsieur *Daille* grants thus much, in that book he published against the tradition of the *latin* Church about the object of Religious Worship, and accuses St. *Basil*, St. *Ambrose*, St. *Jerome*, St. *John Chrysostom*, St. *Augustin*, and many more of those famous lights of antiquity who lived in that age, and above all St. *Gregory Nazienzen*, who is called *the divine* by excellence, of having altered, in this point, the Doctrine of the three foregoing ages. But it will not appear very likely that M. *Daille* should understand the sentiments of the Fathers of the first three ages better than those who gathered, as I may say, the succession of their Doctrine immediately after their deaths; and this will be so much the less credible; because the Fathers of the fourth age were so far from perceiving they introduced any novelty in that worship, that this Minister, on the contrary, has quoted several express texts, by which he shews clearly they pretended, in praying to Saints, to follow the example of their predecessors. But, without any further examination what might be the sentiments of the Fathers of the three first ages, I will content myself with what M. *Daille* is pleased to grant, allowing us so many great men who taught the Church in the fourth age. For tho' he has taken upon him, twelve hundred

—years

years after their deaths, to give them, in derision, the name of a kind of sect, calling them *Reliquarists*, that is to say, Relic-honourers; yet I hope those of his communion will have more respect for these great men. They dare not, at least, accuse them of falling into idolatry, by praying to Saints and honouring their Relics; or of destroying that trust which Christians ought to put in JESUS CHRIST; and it is to be hoped henceforwards they will not reproach us with these things, when they consider they cannot do it without accusing at the same time these excellent men, whose sanctity and learning they profess a reverence for, as well as we. But seeing our design is here to expound our belief, rather than to shew who were the defenders of it, we must continue our Explanation.

S E C T. IV.

Invocation of Saints.

THE Church, in teaching it is profitable to pray to Saints, teaches us to pray to them in the same spirit of charity, and according to the same order of fraternal society, which moves us to demand assistance of our brethren living upon earth; and the Catechism of the Council of *Trent* concludes from this Doctrine, That if the quality of

Mediator, which the Scripture gives to JESUS CHRIST, received any prejudice from the intercession made to the Saints, who reign with God, it would receive no less from the intercession made to the faithful who live with us. (*Cat. Rom. par. 3. tit. de Cultu & Invoc. Sanct.*)

THIS Catechism shews us clearly the extreme difference there is betwixt our manner of imploring God's assistance, and that of imploring the aid of Saints: (*Par. 4. tit. Quis orandus sit?*) For, says it, we pray to God either to give us good things, or to deliver us from evil; but because the Saints are more acceptable to him than we are, we beg of them to undertake our cause, and to obtain for us those things we stand in need of. From whence it comes to pass, that we use two very different forms of Prayer; for to God the proper manner of speaking is to say, Have mercy on us, Hear us; whereas we only desire the Saints to Pray for us; whereby we ought to understand, that in what terms soever those prayers, which we address to Saints, are couched, the intention of the Church, and of her faithful, reduces them always to this form, as the Catechism presently after confirms. (*ibid.*)

BUT it is good to consider the words of the Council itself, which prescribing to Bishops how they ought to speak of the invocation of Saints, obliges them to teach,
That

That the Saints who reign with JESUS CHRIST offer up to God their prayers for men; that it is good and profitable to invoke them after an humble manner, and to have recourse to their prayers, aid and assistance, to obtain of God his benefits, thro' our Lord JESUS CHRIST his Son, who is our only Saviour and Redeemer, (Sess. 25. de Invoc. &c.) After which the Council condemns those who teach a contrary Doctrine. We see then, to invoke the Saints, according to the sense of this Council, is to have recourse to their prayers for obtaining benefits from God, thro' JESUS CHRIST: So that, in reality, we do not obtain those benefits, which we receive by the intercession of the Saints, otherwise than thro' JESUS CHRIST, and in his name; seeing these Saints themselves pray in no other manner than thro' JESUS CHRIST, and are not heard but in his name. This is the Faith of the Church, which the Council of *Trent* has clearly explained in few words. After which we cannot imagine that any one should accuse us of forsaking JESUS CHRIST, when we beseech his members, who are also ours, his children, who are our brethren, and his Saints, who are our first fruits, to pray with us, and for us, to our common master, in the name of our common mediator.

THE same Council explicates clearly, and in few words, what is the intention of the Church,

Church, when she offers up to God the dreadful Sacrifice to honour the memory of his Saints. This honour which we render them in sacrificing, consists in naming them in the prayers we offer up to God, as his faithful servants, and in rendering him thanks for the victories which they have gained, and in humbly beseeching him that he would vouchsafe to favour us by their intercession. St. *Augustin* (*De civit. Dei*, lib. 22. ch. 10.) has told us, twelve hundred years ago, that we ought not to think any sacrifices were offered to the holy Martyrs, altho' the practice of the universal Church in that time was to offer Sacrifice upon their holy bodies, and at their *memorials*; that is, before those places where their precious relics were preserved. This Father has moreover added, *that they made a commemoration of the Martyrs at the holy Altar, in the celebration of the Sacrifice; not to pray for them, as they do for other persons who are dead, but rather, that they might pray for us.* (Tract. 84. in *Joan. Serm.* 17. in *verb. Apost.*) I relate the sentiments of this holy Bishop, because the Council of Trent makes use almost of his very words, to teach the faithful, that *the Church offers not Sacrifice to the Saints, but to God alone, who has crowned them; that the Priest also addresses not himself to St. Peter and St. Paul, saying, I offer you this Sacrifice; but, rendering thanks to God for their victories, he de-*
mands

mands their assistance, that those whose memory we celebrate upon earth would vouchsafe to pray for us in Heaven. After this manner it is we honour the Saints, that we may obtain the graces of God, by their intercession; and the principal of those *graces* we hope to obtain, is that of imitating them; to which we are excited by the consideration of their admirable examples, and by the honour which we render in the presence of God to their happy memories.

THOSE who will rightly consider the Doctrine we have proposed, will be obliged to grant us, that as we do not rob God of any of those perfections peculiar to his infinite essence; so we do not attribute to creatures any of those qualities, or operations, proper to God alone: Which distinguishes us so fully from Idolaters, that we cannot comprehend why such a title should be given us.

AND when these Gentlemen of the pretended Reformation object to us, that by addressing our prayers to the Saints, and honouring them, all the world over, as present, we attribute to them a certain kind of immensity, or at least the knowledge of the secrets of hearts, which God has nevertheless reserved to himself, as it appears by so many testimonies of Scripture, they do not sufficiently reflect upon our Doctrine. For, in fine, without examining what grounds may be had to attribute to the Saints some

certain degree of knowledge as to those things which are acted amongst us, or also of our secret thoughts, it is manifest that to say a creature may have the knowledge of these things, by a light communicated to him by God, is not to elevate a creature above his condition. The example of the Prophets justify this clearly, God having not disdained to discover future things to them, tho' they seem much more particularly reserved to his own knowledge.

MOREOVER, never any Catholic yet thought the Saints knew our necessities by their own power, no nor the desires which move us to address our secret prayers to them. The Church contents herself to teach, with all antiquity, these prayers to be very profitable to such who make them, whether it be the Saints who know them by the ministry and communication of Angels, who, according to the testimony of Scripture, know what passes amongst us, being established by God's order, as administering spirits, to co-operate with us in the work of our salvation; whether it be that God himself makes known to them our desires by a particular *revelation*; or lastly, whether it be that he discovers the secret to them in his *divine essence*, in which all truth is comprised. So that the Church has not decided any thing about these different methods which God might be pleased to make use of for that end.

BUT

BUT let these means be what they will, it is always certain the Church does not attribute to the creature any of these divine perfections, as the idolaters did; seeing she permits us not to acknowledge, even in the greatest Saints, any degree of excellency, which does not proceed from God; nor any acceptableness in his sight, but by their virtues; nor any virtue which is not a gift of his grace; nor any knowledge of human affairs, but what is communicated to them; nor any power to assist us, but by their prayers; nor, in fine, any felicity, but by a submission and a perfect conformity to his divine will.

It is therefore true, that by examining what are our interior sentiments concerning the Saints, it will be found we do not raise them above the condition of creatures; and from thence one ought to judge of what nature that exterior honour is, which we render them; exterior veneration being established to testify the interior sentiments of the mind.

BUT because this honour, which the Church renders to the Saints, appears principally before their images and holy relics, it will be proper to explicate her belief concerning them.

SECT.

S E C T. V.

Images and Relics.

AS for Images, the Council of Trent forbids us expressly *to believe any divinity or virtue in them, for which they ought to be revered; to demand any favour of them, or put any trust in them, and ordains that all the honour which is given to them, should be referred to the originals which are represented by them.* (Sess. 25. *de invoc. &c.*)

ALL these words of the Council are like so many characters to distinguish us from idolaters, seeing we are so far from believing with them any divinity annexed to the Images; that we do not attribute to them any other virtue but that of exciting in us the remembrance of those they represent.

THE honour we render Images is grounded upon this. No man, for example, can deny but that when we look upon the figure of JESUS CHRIST crucified, it excites in us a more lively remembrance of *him who loved us so as to deliver himself up to death for us.* (Gal. 2.) While this Image being present before our eyes, causes so precious a remembrance in our souls, we are moved to testify, by some exterior signs, how far our gratitude extends, and by humbling ourselves before the Image, we shew what is our submission

to its divine original. So that, to speak precisely, and according to the ecclesiastical stile, when we honour the Image of an Apostle or a Martyr, our intention is not so much to honour the Image, as to honour the Apostle or Martyr in presence of the Image. Thus the Roman Pontifical tells us ; and the Council of Trent expresses the same thing, when it says, *that the honour we render to Images, has such a reference to those they represent, that by the means of those Images which we kiss, and before which we kneel, we adore JESUS CHRIST, and honour the Saints, whose types they are.* (Pont. Rom. Bened. Imag. Sess. 25.)

IN fine, one may know with what intention the Church honours Images, by the honour she renders the Cross and the Scripture. All the world sees very well, that before the Cross she adores him who bore our iniquities upon the wood ; (1. Pet. 2.) and that if her children bow the head before the book of the gospel, if they rise up out of respect when it is carried before them, and if they kiss it reverently, all this honour is referred to the eternal verity which it proposeth to us.

THEY must have but little justice who treat with the term of Idolatry that religious sentiment which moves us to uncover our heads, and bow them before the Image of the Cross, in remembrance of him who was crucified for the love of us ; and it would be too much blindness not to perceive the excessive difference

difference there is betwixt those who put their trust in Idols, out of an opinion that some divinity or virtue, was, as I may say, tied to them, and those who declare, as we do, that they will not make use of Images, but to raise their minds towards heaven, that they may there honour JESUS CHRIST or his Saints, and in the Saints God himself, who is the author of all sanctity and grace.

AFTER the same manner we ought to understand that honour which we pay to Relics, following the example of the primitive Church; and if our adversaries would but consider that we look upon the bodies of Saints, as having been victims offered up to God either by martyrdom or by penance, they would not think the honour which we pay them upon this account, could alienate us from that which we render to God himself.

WE may say in general, That if they would but consider how the affection which we bear to any one propagates itself, without being divided, to his children, friends, and after that, by several degrees, to the representation of him, or any remains of him, and to any thing which renews in us his remembrance; if they did but conceive that honour has the like progression, seeing honour is nothing else but love mixed with respect and fear; in fine, If they would but consider, that all the exterior worship of the Catholic Church has
its

its source in God himself, and returns back again to him, they would never believe this worship, which he himself alone animates, could excite his jealousy. They would see, on the contrary, that if God, as jealous as he is of the love of man, does not look upon us as dividing ourselves betwixt him and creatures, when we love our neighbour for the love of him; the same God, tho' jealous of the honour which his faithful pay him, cannot look upon them as dividing that worship which is due to him alone, when, out of respect to him, they honour those whom he has honoured.

It is true, nevertheless, that seeing the sensible marks of reverence are not all of them absolutely necessary, the Church might, without the least alteration in her Doctrine, extend these exterior practices more or less, according to the different exigencies of times, places, or occurrences, being desirous that her children should not be slavishly subject to sensible things, but only excited, and, as it were, advertised by their means to fly to God, and to offer up to him in spirit and truth that rational service which he expects from his creatures.

ONE may see, by this Doctrine, with what truth I affirmed that a great part of our controversies would vanish by the sole understanding of the Terms, if these points were but discussed with charity. And if our
adversaries

adversaries would but with moderation consider the foregoing explications, which comprehend the express Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*, they would cease to accuse us of injuring the mediation of JESUS CHRIST, of invocating the Saints, and adoring Images after a manner which is peculiar to God alone. It is true, that seeing, in one sense, Adoration, Invocation, and the name of Mediator are only proper to God and JESUS CHRIST, it is no hard matter to misapply these terms, whereby to render our Doctrine odious. But if they be strictly kept to that sense in which we use them, these objections and accusations will lose their force; and if any other less important difficulties remain to these gentlemen of the pretended Reformed Religion, sincerity will oblige them to acknowledge they are satisfied as to the principal subject of their complaints.

FURTHERMORE, there is nothing so unjust as to accuse the Church of placing all her piety in these devotions to the Saints, seeing, as we have already observed, the Council of *Trent* contents itself with teaching the faithful, that this practice is *good and beneficial*, without saying any more of it. (Sess. 25.) So that the intention of the Church is only to condemn those, who reject this practice, either out of contempt or error. She is obliged to condemn them, because she is obliged not to suffer any practice

tice which is beneficial to salvation to be despised, nor a Doctrine authorised by antiquity, to be condemned by novelists.

S E C T. VI.

Justification.

THE Doctrine of Justification, will shew yet more clearly how many difficulties may be ended by a plain exposition of our sentiments.

THOSE who are never so little versed in the history of the pretended Reformation, are not ignorant that its first authors propos'd this article to all the world as the principal of all the rest, and as the most essential cause of their separation: So that this is the most necessary to be well understood.

WE believe, in the first place, that *our sins are freely forgiven us by the divine mercy, for JESUS CHRIST's sake.* (Sess. 6. c. 9.) These are the express terms of the Council of Trent, which adds, that *we are said to be justified gratis, because none of those acts which precede justification, whether they be faith or good works, can merit this grace.*

SEEING the Scripture explicates the remission of sins, by sometimes telling us that God covers them, and sometimes that he takes them away, and blots them out by the grace of his holy Spirit, which makes us new creatures;

we

we believe, that, to form a perfect idea of the justification of a sinner, we must join both these expressions together. For which reason we believe our sins not only to be covered, but also *entirely washed away* by the blood of JESUS CHRIST, and by the grace of re-generation; which is so far from obscuring or lessening that idea which we ought to have of the merit of this blood, that, on the contrary, it heightens and augments it.

So that the Justice of JESUS CHRIST is not only *imputed*, but *actually communicated* to the faithful, by the operation of the Holy Spirit; insomuch that they are not only reputed, but rendered just by his Grace.

If that Justice which is in us were only such in the eyes of men, it would not be the work of the Holy Ghost; it is then a Justice, and that before God, seeing it is God himself who produces it in us, by infusing his Charity in our hearts.

NEVERTHELESS it is too true, that *the flesh rebels against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh*, and that *we all offend in many things*. (Gal. 5. 17. Jam. 3. 2.) So that, tho' our Justice be truly such, by the infusion of his charity, yet it is not perfect Justice; because of the combat of concupiscence: Insomuch that the continual sighings of a soul, penitent for her offences, is the most necessary duty of Christian Justice, which obliges us to confess humbly with
St.

The Merit of Good Works. 69

St. *Augustin*, that our Justice in this life consists rather in the remission of sin than in the perfection of virtues.

S E C T. VII.

The Merit of Good Works.

AS to the merit of Good Works, the Catholic Church teaches us, that *eternal life ought to be proposed to the children of God, both as a grace, which is mercifully promised to them by the mediation of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, and as a recompence which is faithfully rendred to their good Works and Merits, by virtue of this promise.* These are the proper terms of the Council of *Trent*. (Sess. 6. c. 16.) But lest human pride should flatter itself with an opinion of a presumptuous merit, the same Council teaches us, that all the price and value of a Christian's works proceeds from the sanctifying grace which is given us *gratis* in the name of JESUS CHRIST, and that it is an effect of the continual influence of this divine Head upon it's Members.

REALLY the precepts, exhortations, promises, threatnings and reproaches of the Gospel, shew clearly enough we must work out our salvation by the co-operation of our wills, with the grace of God assisting us : But it is one of our first principles, That
the

70 *The Merit of Good Works.*

the Free will can act nothing conducing to eternal happines, but as it is moved and elevated by the Holy Ghost.

So that the Church knowing it is this divine Spirit which works in us, by his Graces, all the good we do, she is obliged to believe that the good Works of the faithful are very acceptable to God, and of great consideration before him; and it is just she should make use of the word *Merit*, with all Christian antiquity, whereby she may principally denote the value, price, and dignity of those Works which we perform thro' grace. But seeing all their sanctity comes from God, who produces them in us, the same Church has, in the Council of *Trent*, received these words of *St. Augustin*, as a Doctrine of Catholic Faith, That God crowns his own gifts in crowning the merits of his servants.

WE beg of those who love truth and peace, that they would be pleased here to read the words of this Council a little more at length, that they may once for all disabuse themselves of those false impressions which have been given them concerning our Doctrine. *Altho' we see, say the Fathers in this Council, that holy Writ esteems Good Works so much that JESUS CHRIST himself promises, That a glass of cold water given to the poor shall not want it's reward; and that the Apostle testifies how a moment of*
light

The Merit of Good Works. 71

Light pain endured in this world, shall produce an eternal weight of glory; nevertheless, God forbid a Christian should trust and glory in himself, and not in our Lord, whose bounty is so great to all men that he will have those gifts which he bestows upon them to be their merits. (Sess. 6. c. 16.)

THIS Doctrinē is dispersed throughout the whole Council, which teaches us, in another session, (Sess. 14. 8.) That we, who can do nothing of ourselves, can do all things with him who strengthens us, in such sort that man has nothing of which he may glory, nor for which he may confide in himself; but all his confidence and glory is in JESUS CHRIST, in whom we live, in whom we merit, in whom we satisfy, bringing forth fruits worthy of penance, which draw their virtue from him, and by him are offered to his Father, and accepted of by his Father thro' him. Wherefore we ask all things, we hope all things, we render thanks for all things, thro' our Lord JESUS CHRIST. We confess aloud we are not acceptable to God but in and by him; and we cannot comprehend why any other thought should be attributed to us. We so place all the hopes of our salvation in him, that we daily make use of these words to God in the sacrifice; Vouchsafe, O God, to grant to us sinners, thy servants, who hope in the multitude of thy mercies, some part and society with the blessed Apostles and Martyrs—

into

72 *The Merit of Good Works.*

into whose number we beseech thee to be pleased to receive us, not looking upon our merits, but graciously pardoning us in the name of JESUS CHRIST our Lord.

WILL the Church never be able to persuade her Children, now become her adversaries, neither by the Exposition of her Faith, nor by the Decisions of her Councils, nor by the Prayers in her Sacrifice, that her belief is, she can have no life but in JESUS CHRIST, and that she has no hope but in him? This hope is so firm, it makes the children of God, who walk faithfully in his ways, find *a peace which surpasseth all understanding*, as the Apostle tells us. (Phil. 4. 7.) But tho' this hope be stronger than the promises and menaces of the world, and sufficient to calm the troubles of our consciences; yet it does not wholly extinguish fear: for tho' we be assured God will never abandon us of his own accord, yet we are never certain we shall not lose him by our own fault, in rejecting his inspirations. He has been pleased by his saving fear to mitigate that confidence which he has infused into his children, because, as St. *Augustin* tells us, such is our infirmity in this place of temptations and dangers, that an absolute security would produce tepidity and pride in us; whereas this fear, which, according to the Apostles command, *makes us work out our salvation with trembling*, renders us more vigilant,

gilant, and makes us rely with a more humble dependance upon him who works in us by his grace, both to will, and to do, according to his good pleasure, as the same St. Paul expresses it. (Phil. II, 12, 13.)

THUS you have seen what is most necessary in the doctrine of Justification; and our adversaries would be very unreasonable, if they should not confess that this Doctrine suffices to teach Christians, they are obliged to refer all the glory of their salvation to God thro' JESUS CHRIST.

IF the Ministers after this should undertake to move questions about subtleties, it is good to advertise them, that it becomes them not now to be too scrupulous in our behalfs, after having granted what they have done to the *Lutherans*, and their own brethren, concerning Predestination and Grace. This their conduct towards them ought to have taught them, in this matter, to confine themselves to what is absolutely necessary for the establishment of the foundations of Christian piety.

BUT if they could but once resolve to retain themselves within these limits, they would be presently satisfied, and they would cease to accuse us of annulling the Grace of God, by attributing all to our good works; seeing we have shewn them, in such clear terms of the Council of Trent, these three Points,

74 *Satisfactions, Purgatory,*

Points, so decisive as to this Matter ; *That our Sins are pardoned us out of pure mercy, for the sake of JESUS CHRIST ; That we are indebted for that Justice which is in us by the Holy Ghost to a liberality gratis bestowed upon us ; and that all the good works we do are but so many gifts of his Grace.*

AND indeed we must acknowledge, that the learned of their Party do not contend so much of late about this subject as they did formerly ; and there are few but who now confess, there ought not to have been a breach upon this Point. But if this important difficulty about Justification, upon which their first Authors laid all their stress, be not looked upon now as essential by the wisest persons amongst them, we leave them to think what they ought to judge of their separation, and what hopes there would be of an union ^{or} if they would but overcome their prejudice, and quit the spirit of contention.

S E C T. VIII.

Satisfactions, Purgatory and Indulgences.

WE must further explicate after what manner we believe we can make Satisfaction to God, thro' his grace, that we may not leave any doubt upon this matter unclear'd.

CATHOLICS

CATHOLICS unanimously teach, that JESUS CHRIST, God and man, was solely capable, thro' the infinite dignity of his person, to offer up to God a sufficient Satisfaction for our Sins. But having satisfied superabundantly, he could apply this infinite Satisfaction to us after two manners: Either by an entire Remission, without reserving any punishment; or else by changing a greater punishment into a less, that is, an eternal pain into a temporal one. This first manner being the completest and most conformable to his goodness, he makes use of it immediately in Baptism; but we believe he makes use of the second in the pardon he grants to those who fall after Baptism, being obliged in some manner to it by the ingratitude of those who have abused his first gifts, so as they are to suffer some temporal pain, tho' the eternal be remitted.

IT must not be hence concluded, that JESUS CHRIST has not fully satisfied for us; but, on the contrary, that having obtained an absolute dominion over us, by the infinite price he has given for our salvation, he grants us pardon, upon what condition, what law, or with what restriction it pleases him.

WE should be injurious and ungrateful to our Saviour, should we dare to deny the infinite value of his merits, under pretence that when he pardons us the sin of *Adam*, he does not

76 *Satisfaction, Purgatory,*

not at the same time free us from all the consequences of it, but leaves us still subject to death, and so many other corporal and spiritual infirmities, which this sin brought upon us. It suffices that JESUS CHRIST has once paid the price, by which we shall be one day entirely freed from the evils which overwhelm us; it is our parts to embrace with humility and thanksgiving every part of his benefits, by considering by what progress it pleases him to procure our deliverance, according to that order which his wisdom has established for our good, and for a clearer manifestation of his bounty and justice.

UPON the like account we ought not to think it strange that he, who has shewn us so great mercy in Baptism, should be more severe towards us, after our having violated our holy promises. It is just, yes and beneficial to our Salvation, that God in remitting our sin, together with the eternal pain which we deserved for it, should exact of us some temporal pain, to retain us in our duties, lest if we should be too speedily freed from the bonds of Justice, we should abandon ourselves to a rash confidence, abusing the facility of a pardon.

It is then to satisfy this obligation we are subject to some painful works, which we must accomplish in the Spirit of Humility and Penance; and it was the necessity of these satisfactory works which obliged the primitive

primitive Church to impose upon Penitents those pains called canonical.

WHEN therefore she imposes upon Sinners painful and laborious works, and they undergo them with humility, this is called *Satisfaction*; and when, regarding the fervour of the Penitents, or some other good works which she has prescribed them, she relaxes some part of that pain which is due to them, this is call'd *Indulgence*.

THE Council of *Trent* proposes nothing else to be believed concerning *Indulgences*, but that *the power to grant them has been given to the Church by JESUS CHRIST, and that the use of them is beneficial to Salvation*; to which this Council adds, *that this power ought to be retained, yet nevertheless used with moderation, lest ecclesiastical discipline should be weakened by an over-great facility*; which shews the manner of granting Indulgences to regard discipline. (*Sess. 25.*)

THOSE who depart this life in grace and charity, but nevertheless indebted to the divine justice some pains which it reserved, are to suffer them in the other life. This is what obliged all the primitive Christians to offer up prayers, alms-deeds and sacrifices, for the faithful who departed in peace and in the communion of the Church, with an assured faith that they could be assisted by these means. This is what the Council of *Trent* proposes

proposes to our belief touching the souls detained in Purgatory, without determining in what their pains consist, or many other such like things ; concerning which this holy Council demands great moderation, blaming those who divulge what is uncertain or suspected.

SUCH is the innocent and holy Doctrine of the Catholic Church touching Satisfactions, which has been imputed to her as so great a crime. If after this Explication, those gentlemen of the pretended Reform'd Religion accuse us of injuring the *Satisfaction* of JESUS CHRIST, they must have forgotten what we told them, *That our blessed Saviour paid the full price of our Redemption; that nothing is wanting in this price, because it is infinite; and how these remaining pains, of which we have spoken, come not from any defect in this payment, but from a certain order which he has established to retain us in a saving discipline by just apprehensions.*

BUT if they also tell us, *we believe we can of ourselves satisfy for some part of the pain due to our sins,* we can with confidence assure them, the contrary appears by the maxims we have established ; which maxims make it clearly appear, that our Salvation is no other but a work of Mercy and Grace ; that what we do by the grace of God is no less his work, than what he does alone by his absolute power ; and lastly, that what we give to him appertains

appertains no less to him, than what he gives to us. To which we must add, that what we call *Satisfaction*, following the example of the primitive Church, is, after all, nothing but the application of the infinite *Satisfaction* of JESUS CHRIST.

THIS very consideration ought to appease those who are offended when we tell them, that God is so well pleased with fraternal Charity and the communion of Saints, that he frequently also accepts of those *Satisfactions* which we offer up one for another. It seems these gentlemen don't conceive how much all we are belongs to God, nor how all the kindnesses which his bounty makes him have for the faithful, the members of JESUS CHRIST, are necessarily referred to this divine head. But certainly those who have read and considered how God himself inspires his Servants with a desire to afflict themselves with fasting, hair-cloth and ashes, not only for their own sins, but also for the sins of all the people, will not be astonished if we say, that being touched with the delight he has to gratify his friends, he mercifully accepts of the humble Sacrifice of their voluntary mortifications, in abatement of those chastisements he prepared for his people; which shews, that being satisfied by these he renders himself more mild towards the others; by this means honouring his Son JESUS CHRIST.

CHRIST in the communion of his members, and in the holy society of his mystical body.

S E C T. IX.

The Sacraments.

THE order of Doctrine requires we should now speak of the Sacraments, by which the merits of JESUS CHRIST are applied to us. Seeing the disputes we have concerning them, if we except the Eucharist, are not so hot as the others; we will in the first place clear, in short, the chiefest difficulties which are raised concerning the other, and reserve the Eucharist, as the most important of all the rest, till the last.

THE Sacraments of the new covenant are not sacred signs only which represent grace, nor seals which confirm it; but the instruments of the Holy Ghost, which serve to apply it to us, and which confer it upon us by virtue of the words which are pronounced and the exterior action which is performed, upon condition we put no impediment there-to by our not being rightly disposed.

WHILST God annexes so great grace to exterior signs, which have not of their own nature any proportion with so admirable an effect, he shews us clearly, that besides all we can do interiorly of ourselves by our good disposition,

disposition, there must necessarily intervene, before we can be justified, a special operation of the Holy Ghost, and a peculiar application of the merit of our Saviour, which is exhibited to us by the Sacraments. So that this Doctrine cannot be rejected without injuring the merits of JESUS CHRIST and the operation of his divine power in our regeneration.

WE acknowledge seven sacred Signs or Ceremonies established by JESUS CHRIST, as the ordinary means for the sanctification and perfection of the new man. Their divine institution appears in the holy Scripture, either by the express words of JESUS CHRIST, who established them, or by the grace which, according to the same Scripture, is annexed to them, and necessarily shews a divine institution.

Baptism.

SEEING little Children cannot supply the want of Baptism by acts of faith, hope and charity, nor by the vow to receive this Sacrament, we believe that, if they do not really receive it, they do not in any manner partake of the grace of Redemption; and therefore dying in *Adam* they have not any part in JESUS CHRIST:

It is good to observe here how the *Lutherans* believe with the Catholic Church the absolute necessity of Baptism, and are astonished

82 *Confirmation, Penance, &c.*

nished, with her, that such a truth should be denied, which never any one before *Calvin* durst openly call in question, it was so firmly rooted in the minds of all the faithful.

NEVERTHELESS, the pretended Reform'd are not afraid to let their children voluntarily die like the children of the Infidels, without bearing any mark of Christianity, and without receiving any grace thereof, if their deaths should chance to prevent the day of their assembly.

Confirmation.

THE Imposition of Hands practised by the holy Apostles, to confirm the faithful against Persecutions, having its principal effect in the interior descent of the Holy Ghost, and the infusion of his Gifts, it ought not to have been rejected by our adversaries, under pretence the Holy Ghost descends now no more visibly upon us. Thus all Christian Churches since the Apostles times have religiously retained it, making use also of holy Chrism, to shew the virtue of this Sacrament by a more express representation of the interior unction of the Holy Ghost. (*Acts* 8. 15.)

Penance, and Sacramental Confession.

WE believe that JESUS CHRIST has been pleased, that those who have submitted themselves to the authority of the Church by Baptism, and who have since violated the laws

Penance and Sacramental Confession. 83

laws of the Gospel, should come and submit themselves to the judgment of the same Church in the tribunal of Penance, where she exercises the power which is given her of remitting and retaining sins. (*Matth.* 18. 18. *John* 20. 23.)

THE terms of that commission which is given to the Ministers of the Church to absolve from sin are so general, they cannot without temerity be restrained to public sins; and seeing when they pronounce that absolution in the name of JESUS CHRIST, they only follow the express terms of this Commission, the sentence is look'd upon as rendred by JESUS CHRIST himself, by whom they are established judges. It is this invisible High Priest who interiorly absolves the Penitent, whilst the Priest exteriorly exercises the function.

THIS penitential Court of Judicature being so necessary a curb to licentiousness, so plentiful a source of wise admonitions, so sensible a consolation for Souls afflicted for their sins, when their absolution is not only declared in general terms, as it is practised by the Ministers, but when they are in reality absolved by the authority of JESUS CHRIST, after a particular examination, and knowledge of the case. We cannot believe our adversaries can look upon so many benefits without regretting their loss, and being somewhat ashamed of a Reformation which has cast off so saving and holy a practice.

84 *Extreme Unction, Marriage.*

Extreme Unction.

THE Holy Ghost having, according to the testimony of St. *James* (5. 14.) annexed an exprefs promise of remission of fins and comfort of the sick to Extreme Unction, nothing is wanting to make this sacred ceremony a true Sacrament. It is only to be remarked, that according to the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*, (*Seff.* 14. c. 2. de Sac. Extr. Unc.) the sick are more relieved in respect of the soul than of the body; and that as the spiritual profit is always the principal object of the new law, so it is that also which we ought absolutely to expect from this holy unction, if we be rightly disposed for it; whereas the ease in sickness is only granted with respect to our eternal salvation, according to the secret dispositions of divine Providence, and the different degrees of preparation and faith which is found in the faithful.

Marriage.

WHEN we consider how JESUS CHRIST has given a new form to Marriage, reducing this holy society to two persons immutably and indissolubly united; and when we see this inseparable union the sign of his eternal union with his Church, we shall not have any difficulty to comprehend that the marriage of the faithful is accompanied by the Holy Ghost and by Grace; and we shall

praise

praise the divine bounty for having been thus pleased to consecrate the origin of our birth. (*Mat. 19. 5. Eph. 5. 32.*)

Orders.

THE Imposition of Hands, which the administrators of sacred things receive, being accompanied with so apparent a virtue of the Holy Ghost, and so full an infusion of his Grace, it ought to be placed amongst the number of the Sacraments (*1 Tim. 4. 2 Tim. 1.*) And indeed we must acknowledge our adversaries do not absolutely exclude the Consecration of Ministers, but only exclude it from the number of the Sacraments which are common to the whole Church. (*Conf. de Foi. art. 35.*)

S E C T. X.

Doctrine of the Church touching the Real Presence of the body and blood of JESUS CHRIST in the Eucharist, and the manner how the Church understands these words, This is my body.

WE are come, you see, at last to the question of the Eucharist, where it will be necessary to explicate our Doctrine more fully, however without exceeding too much the bounds we have prescribed ourselves.

THE

THE Real Presence of the body and blood of our Saviour is so solidly established by the words of the institution, which we understand literally; and there is no more reason to ask us why we fix ourselves to the proper literal sense, than there is to ask a traveller why he follows the high road. It is their parts who have recourse to the figurative sense, and who take by-paths, to give a reason for what they do. As for us, who find nothing in the words which JESUS CHRIST makes use of for the institution of this mystery obliging us to take them in a figurative sense, we think that a sufficient Reason to determine us to the literal. But we are yet more powerfully engaged thereto when we come to consider in this mystery the intention of the son of God, which I will explicate after the plainest manner I am able, and that by principles which I think our adversaries themselves cannot deny.

I SAY then, these words of our Saviour, *Take eat, this is my body given for you*, (Matth. 16. Luke 22.) shews us, that as the ancient Jews did not in Spirit only unite themselves to the immolation of the Victim, which was offered for them, but that in reality they eat the sacrificed flesh; which was to them a mark of their partaking of that oblation. So JESUS CHRIST becoming himself our Victim, would have us really eat of the flesh of his Sacrifice, that the actual communication of

of his adorable flesh might be a perpetual testimony to every one of us in particular, that it was for us he took it, and for us he immolated it.

GOD had forbidden the *Jews* to eat of the sin-offering, (*Levit. 6. 30.*) to teach them that a true expiation of their crimes was not to be accomplished in the Law, nor by the blood of beasts: All the people lay, as it were, under an interdiction by this prohibition, without being able to have any actual participation of the remission of sins. By a contrary reason it was necessary the body of our blessed Saviour, the true Host immolated for sin, should be eaten by the faithful, to shew them, by this eating, that the remission of sin was accomplished in the new Testament.

GOD also forbad the children of *Israel* to eat blood; (*Levit. 17. 11.*) and one of the reasons for this prohibition was, because the blood was given us for the expiation of our souls: But on the contrary, our blessed Saviour gives us his blood to drink, because it is shed for the remission of sins. (*Matth. 26. 18.*)

So that the eating of the body and blood of the son of God is as real at the holy table as the grace, the expiation of sins and the participation of the Sacrifice of JESUS CHRIST is actual and real in the new covenant.

NEVER.

NEVERTHELESS, seeing he desired to exercise our faith in this mystery, and at the same time to free us from the horror of eating flesh and drinking blood in their proper species, it was convenient he should give us them cloathed under another species. But if these considerations have obliged him to make us partake of the flesh of our victim after another manner than the *Jews*, he was not for that obliged to deprive us in the least of the reality of his substance.

It appears then, that JESUS CHRIST, to accomplish the ancient figures, and to put us in actual possession of the victim offered for our sins, that JESUS CHRIST had intention to give us really his body and blood. Which is so evident, that our adversaries themselves would have us believe they are of the same opinion with us in this, perpetually repeating how they deny not the actual presence, nor the real participation of the body and blood in the Eucharist. This we will examine hereafter, where we think it necessary to represent their sentiments, after we have finished the explication of those of the Church. But in the mean time we will conclude, that if the plainness of our Saviour's words has forced them to acknowledge his express intention was to give us in reality his flesh, when he said *This is my body*, they ought not to be astonished, if we cannot consent to understand these words only in figure.

IN reality, it appears that the Son of God, who was so careful to explain to his Apostles what he taught them under parables and figures, having said nothing here to explain himself, left these words in their natural signification. I know these gentlemen pretend the nature of the thing explains itself sufficiently, because we see very well, say they, what he presents us is nothing but bread and wine : But this reason vanishes when we consider, he who speaks has an authority which over-rules the senses, and a power which has dominion over universal nature.

THE son of God has no more difficulty to render his body present in the Eucharist, by saying, *This is my body*, than to cure a woman of her infirmity by saying, *Woman thou art freed from thy infirmity* ; (Luke 13. 12.) or to preserve the life of a young man by saying to his father, *Thy Son liveth* ; (John 4. 50.) or to forgive the sins of a man sick of the palsy by saying to him, *Thy sins are forgiven thee*. (Matth. 9. 9.)

So that we rest precisely upon his words, not troubling ourselves how he will execute what he has said. He who does what he will, by speaking does what he says ; and it was easier for the son of God to force the laws of nature to verify his word, than it is for us to accommodate our understanding to these kind of violent interpretations, which break the laws of common discourse.

THESE

THESE laws of Discourse teach us, that a sign which represents a thing naturally, receives often the name of the thing represented, it being as it were its nature to bring the idea of the thing into the mind. The same also happens, tho' with some restriction, to instituted signs, when they are received and persons accustomed to them. But that in establishing a sign which of itself has no relation to the thing, as, for example, a morsel of bread to signify the body of a man, the name of the thing signified should be given to it without any explication and before any agreement, as JESUS CHRIST has done in his last Supper, is a thing unheard of, and of which we find no example in holy writ, not to say in any language. Neither do the gentlemen of the pretended Reformed Religion so fix themselves to the figurative sense, which they would give to these words of JESUS CHRIST, but that at the same time they acknowledge he had an intention, in pronouncing them, to give us in reality his body and blood!

S E C T. XI.

Exposition of these Words, Do this in remembrance of me.

AFTER having proposed the sentiments of the Church touching these words, *This is my body,* we must explicate what she thinks

Do this in remembrance of me. 91

thinks of those others which JESUS CHRIST added, *Do this in remembrance of me.* (Luke 22. 19.) It is manifest, the intention of the son of God is to oblige us, by these words, to remember the death which he has endured for our salvation, and St. Paul concludes from these same words, that we *declare the death of our Saviour* in this mystery. (1 Cor. 11. 24.) But they must not persuade themselves the remembrance of our Saviour's death excludes the real presence of his body: On the contrary, if they consider what we have lately explicated, they will clearly understand this commemoration to be grounded upon the real Presence. For as the *Jews* in eating of the Peace-Offerings remembered that they had been immolated for them; in the same manner in eating the flesh of JESUS CHRIST our Victim, we ought to remember that he died for us. This very flesh then, eaten by the faithful, not only renews in us the memory of his immolation, but confirms also the reality of it to us. And we are so far from having reason to say, that this solemn commemoration, which JESUS CHRIST ordains us to make, excludes the presence of his body, that on the contrary, we see this tender remembrance which he would have us to make at the holy table of him, as immolated for us, is grounded upon This, that this very flesh ought to be there taken really, seeing in effect it is not possible for us to forget it was
for

for us he gave his body in Sacrifice. when we see he daily gives us the same Victim to eat.

MUST Christians, under pretence of celebrating in the Lord's Supper the memory of the passion of our Saviour, deprive this pious commemoration of what it has most efficacious and tender in it? Ought they not to consider that JESUS CHRIST does not command them only to remember him, but to remember him in eating of his flesh and blood? Consider the connexion and force of his words. He does not say simply, as those gentlemen of the pretended Reformation seem to understand him, That the bread and wine of the Eucharist should be to us a *memorial* of his body and blood; but he advertises us, that in doing what he prescribed, that is, in receiving his body and blood, we should remember him. What is there in reality more powerful to make us remember him? And if children do so tenderly remember their parents, and their bounties towards them, when they approach the tombs where their bodies are interred, how ought our remembrance and our love to be excited, when we possess, under these sacred veils, under this mystical sepulchre, this living and life-giving flesh, and this blood yet flowing with his love, and full of spirit and Grace? But if our adversaries continue to tell us, that he who commands us to remember him, does
not

Do this in remembrance of me. 93

not give us his proper substance, we must, in fine, desire them to agree amongst themselves. They profess they deny not the real communication of the proper substance of the Son of God in the Eucharist. If their words are serious, if their Doctrine be not an illusion, they must necessarily say with us, the remembrance does not exclude all kinds of presence, but only that which strikes the senses. Their answer shall be ours, seeing that tho' we affirm **JESUS CHRIST** to be present, yet we acknowledge at the same time he is not present after a sensible manner.

AND if it should be demanded, how it comes to pass, that believing as we do, the senses to have nothing to do in this mystery, we should not believe it sufficient that **JESUS CHRIST** should be present by faith: It is easy to answer and to clear this equivocal objection. It is one thing to say the son of God is present to us by faith, and another thing to say, we know by faith that he is present. The first manner of speaking imports only a moral presence; but the second signifies to us a very real one, because our faith is most real; and this real Presence known by faith, is sufficient to work all the forementioned effects in the *just man, who lives by faith.* (Habac. II. 4.)

S E C T.

S E C T. XII.

Exposition of the Calvinists Doctrine concerning the real Presence.

BUT to remove all equivocations which Calvinists make use of in this matter, and shew at the same time how near they have approached to us, it will be convenient to add here the Exposition of their sentiments, tho' I only undertook to explicate the Doctrine of the Church.

THEIR Doctrine has two parts; the one speaks of nothing but the figure, and the other of nothing but the Reality of the *body and blood*. We shall see each of these parts in order.

THEY tell us first, This great miracle of the real Presence, which we admit, is useless; that it is enough for our Salvation that JESUS CHRIST died for us; that his Sacrifice is sufficiently applied to us by faith; and that this application is sufficiently certified to us by the word of God. They add, That if this word must be clothed with sensible signs, it is enough to give plain symbols, such as the water of Baptism, without any necessity of fetching the body and blood of JESUS CHRIST from Heaven.

THERE seems to be nothing more easy than this manner of explicating the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Nevertheless,

our

our adversaries themselves do not think it ought to suffice them. They know such kind of imaginations made the *Socinians* deny the great miracle of the incarnation. God might have saved us, say these heretics, without so much difficulty; he had nothing to do but to pardon our faults, and might have instructed us sufficiently, as well in faith as in manners, by the preaching and examples of a man full of the Holy Ghost, without any need of making him a God. But the *Calvinists*, as well as we, see the weakness of this argument, which appears first from its not appertaining to us to deny or affirm mysteries, according as they appear to us useful or unprofitable to our Salvation. God alone knows the secret thereof; and it is our business to render them useful and saving to us, in believing them as he proposes them, and in receiving his graces after the manner he bestows them upon us. Secondly, not to enter into the question, whether it was possible for God to save us by any other means than the incarnation and death of his son, and not to meddle with that unnecessary dispute, which the gentlemen of the pretended Reformed Religion treat of so at length in the schools; it suffices we have learnt from the Scriptures, that the Son of God has been pleased to testify his love to us by incomprehensible effects. This love has been the cause of this so real an union, by which he became

became man. This love moved him to immolate the *same body* for us, as really as he united himself to it. All these designs are consecutive, and his love maintains itself in all things with the same vigour. So that, when it shall please him to make each of his children experience the goodness he has testified to all in general, by giving himself to them in particular, he will find out a method to accomplish his desires, by no less efficacious means than those by which he had already accomplished our Salvation. Upon which account we must be no longer astonished if he gives to each of us the proper substance of his body and blood. He does it that he may imprint in our hearts, that it was for us he took them, and for us he offered them up in Sacrifice. What preceded makes all that follows credible to us; the order of his mysteries dispose us to believe all this; and his express word permits us not to doubt of it.

OUR adversaries saw very well, that simple figures and signs of his body and blood would not content Christians, who are accustomed to the bounties of a God, who gives himself to us so really. Wherefore they will not suffer us to accuse them of denying a real and substantial participation of JESUS CHRIST in their Supper. They affirm, as well as we, that he makes us there partakers of *his proper substance*; (Cat. Dim. 25.) they tell

tell us, that he *nourishes and quickens us with the substance of his body and blood*; (Conf. de Foi. Art. 36.) and judging it would not be enough to shew us, by some sign, that we are partakers of his Sacrifice, they say expressly, that the *body of our Saviour, which is given us in the last supper assures us of it*: (Cat. Dim. 25.) words very remarkable, which we will examine by and by.

BEHOLD then the body and blood of JESUS CHRIST present in our mysteries by the acknowledgment of the *Calvinists*: For what is communicated *according to its proper substance*, must be really present. It is true, they explicate this Communication, by saying, it is in *spirit* and by *faith*; but it is true also, they will have it real. And because it is impossible to make it intelligible how a body that is communicated to us only in spirit and by faith, can be communicated to us really and in its proper substance; therefore they have not been able to continue firm in the two parts of a Doctrine so contradictory, and they have been obliged to acknowledge two things, which cannot be true, but by supposing what the Catholic Church teaches.

THE first is, that JESUS CHRIST is given to us in the Eucharist after a manner which neither agrees with that of Baptism, nor the preaching of the Gospel, but is peculiar to this

this mystery. We shall see by and by the consequence of this principle ; but let us first see how it is granted us by those gentlemen of the pretended Reformation.

I WILL not here alledge the authority of any particular author, but the proper words of their Catechism, where it explicates what concerns the last Supper. It does not only tell us in express terms, that JESUS CHRIST is given us in the supper in reality, and according to his *proper substance*, but that, *tho' he be truly communicated to us, both by Baptism and the Gospel, yet, nevertheless, it is only in part, and not fully.* (Dim. 53.) From whence it follows, that he is given us in the Lord's Supper fully, and not in part.

There is a vast difference betwixt receiving in part and receiving fully. If then we receive JESUS CHRIST every where else in part, and it be only in the Lord's Supper we receive him fully, it follows, by the consent of our adversaries, that we must look out for a participation in the last supper which is proper only for this mystery, and which does not agree with Baptism and preaching ; but at the same time it follows also, that this participation is not annexed to faith, because faith being generally dispersed thro' all the actions of a Christian, is found in preaching and in Baptism as well as in the Lord's Supper : In reality, it is remarkable, that what desire soever the pretended Reformers had to render

render Baptism and preaching equal to the last supper, because JESUS CHRIST is there truly communicated to us, they durst never affirm in their catechisms, that JESUS CHRIST is given us, in his proper substance, by Baptism and preaching, as they say he is given in the Eucharist. They saw then they could not avoid attributing to the Eucharist a manner of possessing JESUS CHRIST peculiar only to this Sacrament; and that faith, which is common to all the actions of a Christian, could not be this particular manner. But this peculiar manner of possessing JESUS CHRIST in the last Supper ought also to be real, seeing it gives to the faithful the proper substance of the body and blood of JESUS CHRIST. So that we must conclude, from what they grant us, there is in the Eucharist a real manner of receiving the body and blood of our Saviour, which is not performed by faith, and this is what the Catholic Church teaches.

THE second thing granted by the pretended Reformers is taken out of that article which immediately follows that which I have already cited out of their Catechism; which is, *That the body of our Lord JESUS, for as much as it was once offered up in Sacrifice to reconcile us to God, is now given to assure us, we have a part in that reconciliation.*

If there be any sense in these words, if they be not an useless sound and a vain a-

ment, we ought to understand by them, that JESUS CHRIST does not give us a symbol only, but his proper body, to assure us, we partake of his Sacrifice, and of the reconciliation of mankind. But if the reception of the body of our Lord assures us of our participation of the fruits of his death; this participation of the fruits must necessarily be distinguished from the reception of the body, seeing one is the pledge of the other. From whence, to proceed, I say, If our adversaries are forced to distinguish in the last supper the participation of the body of our blessed Saviour, from the participation of the fruits of his grace in his Sacrifice, they must also necessarily make a distinction between the participation of his divine body and all kinds of spiritual participation by faith. This latter participation will never furnish them with two distinct actions; by one of which they receive the body of our Saviour, and by the other the benefit of this Sacrifice; no man being able to conceive what difference there is betwixt partaking by faith of the body of our Saviour, and partaking by faith of the fruit of his death. They must therefore acknowledge, that besides the communion, by which we spiritually partake of the body of our Saviour, and also of his Spirit, by receiving the fruit of his death, there is also a real Communion of the body of the same Saviour, which is to us a certain pledge of the others being assured

sured to us, if we put no impediment to such a Grace by an evil disposition. This is necessarily included in the principles they admit, and they will never be able to explicate this truth, with the least shadow of solidity, if they return not to the sentiments of the Church.

WHO will not here admire the force of truth? All the consequences which follow from the acknowledged principles of our adversaries, are perfectly understood in the sentiment of the Church: The meanliest instructed Catholics without difficulty conceive that in the Eucharist there is a Communion with JESUS CHRIST, which is not to be found any where else. It is no difficulty for them to understand his body is given us to assure us we partake of his Sacrifice and Death. They distinguish clearly betwixt these two necessary manners of uniting ourselves to JESUS CHRIST; the one in receiving his proper flesh; the other, in receiving his spirit; the first of which is granted us as a certain pledge of the second. But seeing these things are inexplicable in the sentiments of our adversaries, tho' on the other hand they cannot deny them, we must necessarily conclude, that error has thrown them into a manifest contradiction.

I HAVE been often astonished they did not explicate their Doctrine after a plainer man-

ner,

ner. Why did they not always, without so many formalities, persevere to say, that JESUS CHRIST having shed his blood for us, represented to us this effusion, by giving us two distinct signs of his body and blood; that he was pleased indeed to give to these signs the name of the thing itself; that these sacred signs were pledges to assure us of our partaking of the fruit of his death, and that we were spiritually nourished by the virtue of his body and blood? After so many endeavours to prove that signs often receive the names of the things signified, and that for this reason the sign of the body might be called the body, all this connection of Doctrine obliges them naturally to fix there. To render these signs efficacious, it sufficed that the grace of Redemption was annexed to them, or rather, according to their principles, that it was in them confirmed to us. They needed not to have tormented themselves, as they have done, to make us understand we receive the proper body of our Saviour, to assure us we partake of the grace of his death. They were well enough satisfied to have the water of Baptism a sign of the blood which washeth us; and it never entred into their fancies to say, we there receive the proper substance of the blood of our blessed Saviour, to assure us his virtue is there diffused upon us. If they had argued after the same inanner as to the Eucharist, their
Doctrine

Doctrine had been less embroiled. But those who invent and innovate, cannot express all they have a mind to. They find certain truths and maxims established which incommode them, and force a violence upon their imaginations. The *Arians* would gladly have refused our blessed Saviour the name of God, or the only son of God. The *Nestorians* did not admit, but with reluctance, that kind of I know not what unity of person in JESUS CHRIST, which we find in their writings. The *Pelagians*, who denied original sin, would also willingly have denied that Baptism was given to little children for the remission of sins: For by that means they would have been freed from the argument which Catholics drew from this practice, to prove that original defect. But, as I just now said, those who find some truths firmly established, have not the boldness to overthrow all. Let the *Calvinists* ingenuously confess the truth; they would have been well pleased to acknowledge in the Eucharist the body of our blessed Saviour only figuratively, and the sole participation of his Spirit in effect, laying aside those great words of *participation of his proper substance*, and the many others which import a real presence, and serve only to perplex them. It would have been more to their humour to have acknowledged, in the Lord's supper, no other communion

communion with JESUS CHRIST but what is also common to preaching and to Baptism, without telling us, as they have done, that in the Lord's supper *he is received in plenitude*, and every where else only *in part*. But however this was their inclination, yet the very force of the terms oppose them, our blessed Saviour having said so precisely of the Eucharist, *This is my body, this is my blood*; which he never did of any other thing, nor upon any other occasion; what likelihood was there of rendering that common to all the actions of a Christian, which his express word had annexed to one particular Sacrament? And farther, the whole order of divine providence, the connection of Doctrine and holy mysteries, the intention of JESUS CHRIST in his last supper, the words themselves which he uttered, and the impression which they naturally form in the minds of the Faithful, give us nothing but the ideas of his real Presence. Therefore it was necessary our adversaries should find out some expressions, the sound of which might, at least, give us a confused idea of this reality. When a man fixes himself either entirely upon faith, as Catholics do, or entirely upon human Reason, as Infidels do, it is easy for him to establish a connected and uniform model of Doctrine: But when a man goes about to make a composition of one and the other, he always says something which he
would

would not say, and afterwards falls into opinions, the sole contrarieties of which shew the manifest falsity of them.

THIS is what has happened to these gentlemen of the pretended Reformed Religion; and God has so permitted it, to facilitate their return to Catholic unity. For, whereas their own experience shews them they must necessarily *express themselves as we do, to speak the language of truth*; ought they not to judge it necessary to *think as we do, to understand it right*? If they observe in *their own belief* many expressions which have no sense but according to *our tenets*, is it not sufficient to convince them, that *truth* is not in its *full perfection but amongst us*? And ought not those *unconnected parts of Catholic Doctrine*, which are scattered here and there in their Catechisms, but which, as I may say, require to be united to the whole; ought they not, I say, to excite them to search, in the *communion of the Church, a full and entire explication of the mystery of the Eucharist*? They would, no doubt, be brought to it, did not *human reflections* trouble and perplex their faith, which has too much dependance upon *sense*. But having shewn what fruit they ought to reap from the *Exposition of their Doctrine*, let us finish the *Exposition of our own*.

S E C T. XIII.

Of Transubstantiation and Adoration, and in what sense the Eucharist is said to be a sign.

IT having been convenient, as was said before, that the senses should not perceive any thing in this mystery of faith, it was necessary nothing should be changed, in respect of them, in the bread and wine of the Eucharist. Upon which account, since we see the same species, and feel the same effects as before in this Sacrament, we must not wonder if the same name be given to them sometimes, and in some certain sense. Yet, notwithstanding, faith being attentive to His word, who performs what pleases him in heaven and on earth, acknowledges here no other substance but what is designed by the same word, that is to say, the proper body and blood of JESUS CHRIST, into which the bread and wine are changed; this is what we call *Transubstantiation*.

HOWEVER, that real verity which is interiorly contained in the Eucharist, hinders not the exterior and sensible part from being a sign; but a sign of such a nature, that it is so far from excluding the reality of the thing signified, it bears it necessarily along with it, seeing that, in effect, these words *This is my body*, pronounced upon that matter,

ter, which JESUS CHRIST himself made choice of, is to us a certain sign that his body is present, and tho' the symbols appear always the same to our senses, yet our mind judges otherwise of them, and not according to sense, because a superior authority interposes. So that, whereas certain species, and a certain sequel of natural impressions on our senses, have been accustomed to design to us the substance of bread and wine, the authority of Him, in whom we believe, causes the same species to begin to shew us another substance: For we give ear to him who said that *this, which we receive and eat, is his body*; and such is the force of these words, as they hinder us from referring those exterior appearances to the substance of bread, and induce us to refer them to the body of JESUS CHRIST there present: Insomuch that the presence of such an adorable object being rendered certain to us by this sign, we are not afraid to pay it our adorations.

I WILL not dwell upon the point of adoration, because the most learned and most intelligent of our adversaries have long since granted us, that those who are persuaded of the real Presence of JESUS CHRIST in the Eucharist ought to pay him in it their adorations.

IN fine, being once convinced the all-powerful words of the son of God operate where-
ever

ever they declare, we believe that in the last supper they had their effect as soon as they were pronounced by him; and by a necessary consequence we acknowledge the real Presence of his body before our receiving of it.

S E C T. XIV.

The Sacrifice of the Mass.

TH E S E things being supposed, there remains no particular difficulty about the Sacrifice which we acknowledge in the Eucharist.

WE have observed two actions in this mystery, which cease not to be distinct, tho' one of them has a relation to the other. The first is the consecration, by which the bread and wine are changed into the body and blood; and the second is the receiving, by which we partake of them.

IN the consecration the body and blood are mystically separated, because **JESUS CHRIST** said separately, *This is my body, this is my blood*; which includes a lively and efficacious representation of the violent death he suffered.

So that the son of God is placed upon the holy table, in virtue of these words, cloathed with those signs which represent his death; this is effected by consecration; and this religious

ligious action carries with it an acknowledgment of God's sovereignty, in as much as JESUS CHRIST there present renews and perpetuates, in some sort, the remembrance of his being obedient, even to the death of the Cross : So that there is nothing wanting to render this a true sacrifice.

WE cannot doubt but this action, as distinct from that of communicating, is of itself acceptable to God, and makes him look upon us with a more propitious eye, because it represents to him that voluntary death which his beloved son has suffered for us sinners ; or rather places before his eyes that very son of his, under the signs of this death, by which his wrath had been appeased.

ALL Christians will confess the sole presence of JESUS CHRIST to be a most powerful intercession before God for all mankind, according to the saying of the Apostle, That JESUS CHRIST *presents himself and appears for us before the face of God.* (Heb. 9. 24.) So that we believe JESUS CHRIST being present upon the holy table, under this figure of death, intercedes for us, and represents continually to his father that death which he has suffered for his Church.

IT is in this sense we say JESUS CHRIST offers up himself to God for us in the Eucharist ; it is after this manner we conceive this oblation renders God more propitious to us,

us, and therefore we call this a propitiatory sacrifice.

WHEN we consider what it is JESUS CHRIST operates in this mystery, and when we see him by faith present upon this holy table, together with these signs of death, we unite ourselves to him in this estate ; we present him to God as our only victim and our sole propitiator by his blood, confessing we have nothing to offer up to God but JESUS CHRIST, and the infinite merit of his death. We consecrate all our prayers by this holy oblation, and in presenting JESUS CHRIST to God, we learn at the same time to offer up ourselves to the divine majesty in him and by him, as living Sacrifices.

THIS is the Sacrifice of Christians, infinitely different from what was offered up in the Old Law : A spiritual Sacrifice becoming the new Covenant, in which the presence of the victim is only perceived by faith ; in which the word of God is the spiritual sword which makes a mystical separation betwixt the body and blood ; in which by consequence the blood is only shed mystically, and in which death only intervenes by representation ; and yet however a most real Sacrifice, in as much as JESUS CHRIST is there truly contained and presented to his Father, under this figure of death : But a commemorative Sacrifice, which is so far from taking away our adhesion to the Sacrifice of the Cross

Sacrifice of the Mass. 111

Cross, as it is objected to us, that, on the contrary it fixes us the firmer to it, by all its circumstances; seeing it has not only an entire relation to it, but, in reality, has neither being nor subsistence but by this relation, from whence it derives all the virtue contained in it.

THIS is the express Doctrine of the Catholic Church in the Council of Trent, which teaches, that this Sacrifice is instituted only to represent that which was once accomplished upon the Cross; to perpetuate the memory of it to the end of the world; and to apply to us the saving virtue of it for the remission of those sins which we commit every day. (Sess. 22, c. 1.) So that the Church is so far from believing that something wants to perfect the Sacrifice of the Cross, on the contrary, she thinks it so perfect, and so fully sufficient, as what is added is only instituted to celebrate the memory and apply its virtue.

By which the same Church acknowledges, that all the merit of the Redemption of mankind depends upon the death of the son of God; and it ought to be understood, from all we have already expounded, that when we say to God in the celebration of the divine mystery, *We offer thee this holy host*, we pretend not by this oblation, to make or present to God a new payment of the price of our salvation, but to offer up to him in our behalfs the merits of our blessed

sed JESUS there present, and the infinite price which he once paid for us upon the Cross.

THE Gentlemen of the pretended Re-form'd Religion do not think they offend JESUS CHRIST, by offering him to God as present to their faith; and if they believed him to be really there, what repugnance could they have to offer him up as truly present; so that the whole dispute ought indeed to be reduced to the real presence alone.

FROM hence forwards all those false ideas, which these Gentlemen of the pretended Reformed Religion form to themselves of the Sacrifice which we offer, ought to be effaced. They ought freely to acknowledge Catholics pretend not to make a new propitiation to appease God afresh, as if he had not been sufficiently satisfied by the Sacrifice of the Cross; or to make some addition to the price of our salvation, as if it were imperfect. All these things have no place in our Doctrine; because all that is here done, is intended by way of intercession and application, after the manner which we have now explicated.

S E C T. XV.

The Epistle to the Hebrews.

AFTER this Explication, those mighty objections drawn from the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, and so much enforced against us, will

will appear to have little reason in them ; and it is in vain our adversaries strive to prove, from the sentiments of the apostle, that we annul the Sacrifice of the Cross. But because the best way to prove that two Doctrines are not opposite to one another is to shew, by explicating them, that no proposition of the one is contrary to the propositions of the other ; I think I am bound in this place to propose in short the Doctrine of this Epistle.

THE Apostle intends, in this Epistle, to teach us, That a sinner could not avoid death, but by substituting some one in his place to die for him ; that whilst men substituted only beasts to be killed in their places, their Sacrifices operated nothing, but a public acknowledgment of their having deserved death ; and that, seeing the divine justice could not be satisfied by so unequal an exchange, they began again every day to slay new victims ; which was a certain mark of the insufficiency of that substitution : But that, since JESUS CHRIST had vouchsafed to die for sinners, God being satisfied by a person so condignly sufficient substituting of himself, had nothing more to exact for the price of our redemption. From whence the Apostle concludes, we ought not only to offer up no more victims after JESUS CHRIST, but that JESUS CHRIST himself ought to be but once offered up to death for us.

LET

114 *Epistle to the Hebrews.*

LET the Reader then, who is solicitous for his Soul's salvation and a lover of truth, reflect a little upon what we have said concerning the manner how JESUS CHRIST offers up himself to God for us in the Eucharist; I am certain he will not find any proposition contrary to those I have here related from the Apostle, or which weakens his argument; so that nothing can be objected to us, but his silence upon this point. But those who would but consider the wise distribution which God makes of his secrets in the several books of Scripture, would not oblige us to receive, from the sole Epistle to the *Hebrews*, all our instructions concerning a matter which was not necessary to the subject of that Epistle; seeing the Apostle intends to explicate in it the perfection of the Sacrifice of the Cross, and not the different manners which God has instituted to apply it to us.

AND, to remove all equivocation, if we take the word *offer* in the sense it is made use of in this Epistle, as implying the actual death of the victim, we will publicly confess that JESUS CHRIST is now no more offered up, neither in the Eucharist nor any where else. But because this word has a larger signification in other places of Scripture, where it is often said, We offer up to God what we present before him; the Church, which forms her language and Doctrine, not from the sole Epistle to the *Hebrews*,
but

but from the whole body of the holy Scripture, is not afraid to say, that JESUS CHRIST offers up himself to God wherever he appears before his face upon our behalf, and that by consequence, he offers up himself in the Eucharist, according to the holy fathers expressions.

Now to imagine this manner of JESUS CHRIST's presenting himself to God, should injure the Sacrifice of the Cross, is what cannot in any kind be supposed, without overthrowing the whole Scripture, and particularly this Epistle, which is so vehemently objected against us. For it must, by the same reason, be concluded, that when JESUS CHRIST offered up himself to God, *In entering into the world* (Heb. 10. 5.) to substitute himself in place of those victims *which could not please him*, he injured that action by which he offered up himself upon the Cross, that when he *continues to appear before God for us*, (Heb. 9. 24.) he weakens that Oblation, *by which he appeared once, by the immolation of himself*; (Heb. 9. 26.) and that *not ceasing to intercede for us*, he accuses of insufficiency that intercession which he made in dying with *so many tears, and such an exclamation*. (Heb. 5. 7.)

ALL this would be ridiculous. We must therefore understand, that JESUS CHRIST, who once offered up himself to be the humble Victim of the divine Justice, does not
cease

cease to offer up himself always for us ; that the infinite perfection of the Sacrifice of the Cross consists in this, that whatsoever preceded it, as well as what follows it, has an entire reference to it ; that as what preceded it was a preparation to it, so that which follows it is the consummation and application of it ; that in reality the payment of the price of our redemption is no more reiterated, because it was fully discharged the first time ; but that what applies that redemption to us continues without ceasing ; lastly, that we must make a distinction betwixt the things which are reiterated as imperfect, and those which are continued as perfect and necessary.

S E C T. XVI.

Reflections upon the preceding Doctrine.

WE earnestly entreat the gentlemen of the pretended Reformation to make some little reflection upon what has been said concerning the Eucharist.

THE Doctrine of the real Presence has been the necessary foundation of it. This foundation is impugned by the *Calvinists* : There is nothing appears more important than this in our controversies, seeing the question is concerning the real Presence of JESUS CHRIST himself : There is nothing our adversaries find more difficult to believe ;
and

and there is nothing in which we are so directly opposite as in this.

IN most other disputes, when these gentlemen hear us with calmness, they find the difficulties vanish, and that they are often more offended with words, than with the things themselves. On the contrary, upon this subject, we agree more about the manner of speaking, because both sides use the words of *real participation*, and the like: But the fuller we explicate ourselves the more we find ourselves opposed; because our adversaries do not receive all the consequences of those truths which they admit, being discouraged, as I said, by the difficulties which sense and human reason find in these *consequences*.

THIS is therefore, to say truly, the most important and difficult of our controversies, and that in which we are most opposite to one another.

NEVERTHELESS God has permitted the *Lutherans* should adhere to the belief of the real Presence as well as we; and he has also permitted the *Calvinists* should declare this Doctrine to have no poison in it; that it does not subvert the foundations of salvation and faith; and that it ought not to break communion betwixt brethren.

LET those gentlemen of the pretended Re-form'd Religion, who think seriously of their salvation, render themselves here attentive to
that

that order which the divine providence makes use of, to bring them insensibly nearer to us and truth. One may either entirely dissipate all the other grounds of their complaints, or at least reduce them to very few heads, with a little explication. In this, where we cannot hope to conquer by this method, they have themselves removed the chief difficulty, by declaring this Doctrine to *contain nothing contrary to salvation, or the fundamentals of Religion.*

It is true, the *Lutherans*, tho' they concur with us in the ground of the reality, yet admit not all the consequences of it. They put bread together with the body of JESUS CHRIST; some of them reject the adoration; and they seem to acknowledge the real Presence only in the act of receiving. But all the subtilty of the Ministers can never persuade ingenuous and understanding persons, but that, if they maintain the real Presence, which is the most important and difficult point, they ought also to maintain the rest.

MOREOVER, the same providence which labours secretly for our nearer union, and lays the foundations of reconciliation and of peace in the midst of bitterness and disputes, has farther permitted the *Calvinists* to allow, that supposing these words, *This is my body*, ought to be taken in a literal sense, Catholics reason better and more consequently than the *Lutherans*.

IF I relate not the passages which have been so often cited on this account, I hope I shall easily be excused, because all those who are not obstinate, will grant us without difficulty, that the real Presence being supposed, our Doctrine is that which most naturally follows.

IT is then an established Truth, that our Doctrine, in this point, contains nothing but the real Presence rightly understood. But we must not stop there; and we beseech the pretended Reformed to consider we make use of no other things to explicate the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, but only such as are necessarily included in this reality of Presence.

IF it should be asked us after this, how it comes then that the *Lutherans*, who believe the real Presence, should nevertheless reject the Sacrifice, which is, according to us, only a consequence of it; our answer is in one word, that this Doctrine must be numbred amongst the other consequences of the real Presence, which these *Lutherans* have not understood, and which we have penetrated much better than they, as the *Calvinists* themselves confess.

IF our Explications persuade these last, that our Doctrine about the Sacrifice is included in that of the real Presence, they ought to see clearly that this mighty dispute of the Sacrifice of the Mass, which has filled so many volumes, and occasioned so many invectives,

120 *Communion under both kinds.*

vestives, ought from henceforwards to be retrenched from the body of their controversies, because this point has not now any particular difficulty, and (which is much more important) because this Sacrifice, against which they have so great repugnance, is no other but a necessary consequence and a natural explication of a Doctrine, which, according to them, *has no venom in it.* Let them now examine themselves, and, after this, try before God whether they have so much reason as they imagine to withdraw themselves from those Altars, where their fore-fathers received the bread of life.

S E C T. XVII.

Communion under both kinds.

T H E R E remains one other consequence of this Doctrine to be examined, which is, that JESUS CHRIST being really present in the Sacrament, the grace and benediction is not annexed to the sensible species, but to the proper substance of his flesh, which is living and lifegiving, because of the divinity which is united to it. Upon which account, all those who believe the real Presence, ought not to have any difficulty to communicate under one sole species, because they there receive all that is essential to this Sacrament, with a plenitude so much the
more

more secure, as there being now no real separation betwixt the body and the blood, as has been said, we receive entirely and without division Him who is solely capable to satiate us.

THIS is the solid foundation, upon which the Church, interpreting the precept of communion has declared, we may receive the sanctification, which this Sacrament carries with it, under one sole species; and if she has reduced her Children to this sole species, it was not out of disesteem of the other, seeing, on the contrary, she did it to hinder those irreverences, which the confusion and negligence of people had occasioned in these later ages, reserving to herself the re-establishment of communion under both kinds, according as it should become more advantageous to peace and unity.

CATHOLIC Divines have made it appear to the gentlemen of the pretended Reformation, how they themselves have made use of several such-like interpretations, in what belongs to the use of the Sacrament; but above all they had reason to remark this which is taken out of the 12th chap. of their discipline, Title, of the Lord's Supper, Art. 7, where we find these words: *The bread of the Lord's supper ought to be administred to those who cannot drink wine, upon their making protestation, that it is not out of contempt, and endeavouring*

122 *Communion under both kinds.*

deavoured what they can possibly, to obviate all scandal even by approaching the cup as near their mouths as they are able. They have judged, by this regulation, that both species were not, by the institution of JESUS CHRIST, essential to the communion; otherwise they ought to have absolutely refused the Sacrament to those who could not receive it whole and entire, and not to give it them after a manner contrary to that which JESUS CHRIST had commanded; in which case their disability would have been their excuse. But our adversaries conceived it would be an excessive rigour, not to allow at least one of the species to those who could not receive the other; and as this condescendence has no ground in scripture, they must acknowledge with us, the words by which JESUS CHRIST proposes to us the two species are liable to some interpretation, and that this interpretation ought to be declared by the authority of the Church.

BUT it might seem as if this article of their discipline, which was made in the synod of *Poitiers* held in the year 1560, had been reformed by the synod of *Vertueil* held in the year 1567, where it is said *the company is not of opinion, the bread should be administered to those who would not receive the cup.* These two synods nevertheless are no ways opposite. That of *Vertueil* speaks only of those who will not receive the cup; and that of *Poitiers* of those

those only *who cannot*. In effect, notwithstanding the synod of *Vertueil*, this article remains in their discipline, and has been also approved by a later synod than that of *Vertueil*, that is, by the synod of *la Rochell* in 1571, where this article was revised and put into that state in which it now is.

BUT supposing the synods of the gentlemen of the pretended Reform'd Religion had differed in their sentiments, it would only follow that the matter in question regards not faith, and that it is of the number of those, which are at the Church's disposal, according to their own Principles.

S E C T. XVIII.

The written and unwritten Word.

THERE remains nothing more, now, but to explicate what Catholics believe touching the Word of God, and the authority of the Church.

JESUS CHRIST having laid the foundation of his Church by preaching, the unwritten Word was the first rule of Christianity; and when the writings of the New Testament were added, this unwritten Word did not upon that account lose its authority; which makes us receive with equal veneration all that was ever taught by the Apostles, whether

124 *The Authority of the Church.*

whether by writing, or by word of mouth, as St. Paul himself has expressly declared. (2 *Theff.* 2. 14.) And it is a most certain sign a Doctrine comes from the Apostles, when it is universally embraced by all Christian Churches, without any possibility of shewing its beginning. We cannot chuse but receive all that is established after this manner, with the submission due to divine authority; and we are persuaded that those gentlemen of the pretended Reformation, who are not obstinate, are in the bottom of their hearts of the same opinion; it being impossible to believe a Doctrine, received from the beginning of the Church can flow from any other source than that of the Apostles. Wherefore our adversaries ought not to wonder if we, who are careful to gather together all our fathers have left us, should preserve the *depositum* of tradition as well as that of the scriptures.

S E C T. XIX.

The Authority of the Church.

THE Church being established by God to be the guardian of scripture and tradition, we receive the canonical scriptures from her; and let our adversaries say what they will, we doubt not but it is her authority which principally determines them to
reverence,

reverence, as divine books, the *Canticle of Canticles*, which has so few visible marks of a prophetic inspiration; the Epistle of St. *James*, which *Luther* rejected; and that of St. *Jude*, which might appear suspected because of some apocryphal books cited in it. In fine, it can only be from this authority they receive the whole body of scripture, which all Christians accept as divine, before their reading of it has made them sensible of the spirit of God in it.

BEING then inseparably bound, as we are, to the holy authority of the Church, by means of the scriptures which we receive from her hands, we learn tradition also from her; and by the means of tradition we learn the true sense of scripture. Upon which account the Church professes she tells us nothing from herself, and that she invents nothing new in her Doctrine; she does nothing but follow and declare the divine Revelation, by the interior direction of the Holy Ghost, who is given to her as her teacher.

THAT dispute, which was raised in the very time of the Apostles, upon account of the ceremonies of the law, shews clearly, that the Holy Ghost explicates himself by the Church; and their acts have, by the method whereby that first contest was decided, taught all succeeding ages by what authority

126 *The Authority of the Church.*

authority all other differences are to be ended. So that as often as there shall happen any disputes to cause a division amongst the faithful, the Church will interpose her authority, and her pastors assembled will say after the Apostles, (Act. 15. 28.) *It has seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us.* And when she has spoken, her Children will be taught, they ought not to begin again to examine those articles once so resolved on; but are bound humbly to receive her decisions. In this we shall follow the example of *St. Paul and Silas*, who carried this first sentence of the Apostles to the faithful, and were so far from permitting a new discussion of what had been decided, that, on the contrary, *They went from place to place, teaching them to observe the ordinances of the Apostles.* (Acts 16. 4.)

THUS it is the children of God acquiesce in the judgment of the Church, believing that from her mouth they hear the oracle of the Holy Ghost; and upon account of this belief it is, that after having said in our Creed, *I believe in the Holy Ghost*, we add immediately, *The holy Catholic Church*; by which we oblige ourselves to acknowledge an infallible and perpetual verity in the universal Church, because this very Church which we believe existent in all ages, would cease to be the Church, if she ceased to teach the truth revealed by God. So that those who apprehend
least

least she should abuse her power to establish a lie, have no faith in him by whom she is governed.

AND if our adversaries would but look upon these things in a more mild and candid manner, they would be obliged to acknowledge, the Catholic Church is so far from making herself mistress of her faith, as they have accused her, that, on the contrary, she has done what she could to bind and deprive herself of all the means of innovation, seeing she not only submits herself to the holy scriptures, but, to the end she might for ever banish all arbitrary interpretations, which make mens imaginations pass for Scripture, she has obliged herself to interpret them, in what relates to faith and manners, according to the sense of the holy Fathers; from which she professes never to depart; declaring in all her Councils, and in all the Professions of Faith she has published, That she does not receive any Doctrine which is not conformable to the tradition of all preceding ages. (*Con. Fid. Sess. 14.*)

MOREOVER, if our adversaries consult their consciences, they will find the name of the Church has more authority over them, than they dare avouch in their disputes; and I don't think there is any one prudent man amongst them, who finding himself the only person of a persuasion, tho' it appeared to him

him never so evident, but would abhor that singularity; so true it is, that men have need in these matters to be supported in their tenets, by the authority of some society that is of the same opinion with them. And for this reason God, who created us, and who knows what is most proper for us, hath ordained for our good, that all particulars should be subject to the authority of his Church, which, of all other authorities, is without doubt the best established. In effect, it is established not only by that testimony, which God himself gives of it in the holy Scriptures, but also by the marks of his divine protection, which are no less visible in the inviolable and perpetual subsistence of it, than in its miraculous establishment.

S E C T. XX.

The sentiments of those of the pretended Reformed Religion, concerning the Authority of the Church.

THIS supreme Authority of the Church is so necessary to regulate the differences which arise in matters of faith, and about the sense of Scripture, that our adversaries themselves, after having decried it as an unsupportable tyranny, have been at last obliged to establish it amongst themselves.

W H E N

WHEN those who are called Independents declared openly, that each one of the faithful ought to follow the light of his own conscience, without submitting his Judgment to the authority of any body, or ecclesiastical assembly, and upon this ground refused to submit to any synods, that of Charenton held 1644, censured this Doctrine upon the same reasons, and for the same inconveniencies, for which we reject it. This synod observes in the first place, that this error of the Independents consists in this, that they teach, *Every Church ought to be governed by her proper laws, without a dependance upon any person in ecclesiastical matters, and without any obligation to acknowledge the authority of conferences and synods for her regulation and conduct.* After which this Synod determines, that *this sect is as prejudicial to the state as to the Church; that it opens a door to all sorts of irregularities and extravagancies; that it takes away all the means of applying any remedy to it; and that if it took place, there might be as many Religions framed as parishes or particular assemblies.* These last words shew it is principally in matters of faith this synod would establish a *Dependance*; seeing the greatest inconvenience into which it observes the faithful would fall by an independence, is, *that there might chance to be as many Religions formed as parishes.* Every Church then, according to the Doctrine

of this synod, and much more every private person, must necessarily depend, in what concerns matters of faith, upon some other superior authority, which resides in some assembly, or in some body; to which authority all the faithful submit their judgments: For the *Independents* refuse not to submit to the word of God, according as they think it ought to be understood; nor to accept the decisions of synods, when, after having examined them, they judge them reasonable. What they refuse to do, is to submit their judgments to that of any assembly for its sake; because our adversaries have taught them, that every assembly, even that of the universal Church, is a society of men subject to error, and to which, by consequence, a Christian ought not to submit his judgment, that submission being only due to God. From this pretension of the *Independents* it is those inconveniencies follow, which the synod of *Charenton* so well observed. For, let a man make what profession he pleaseth to submit himself to the word of God, if every one think he has a right to interpret it according to his own sense, and against the tenets of the Church, declared in her last sentence, this pretension will open a door to all sorts of extravagancies; it will take away all the means of applying a remedy; because the decision of the Church is not a remedy to those who think themselves not obliged to submit to it;

in

in fine, it gives way to the framing as many religions, not only as there are parishes, but also as there are persons.

To avoid these inconveniencies, from whence the ruin of Christianity would follow, the synod of *Charenton* finds herself obliged to establish a dependance in ecclesiastical matters, and that even in points of faith; but this dependance will never hinder those pernicious consequences which they desired to prevent, if they don't, with us, establish this maxim, That every particular Church, and much more every particular person amongst the faithful, ought to believe themselves obliged to submit their private judgment to the authority of the Church.

THUS we see in the fifth chapter of the discipline of the gentlemen of the pretended Reformed Religion, under the title of *Consistories*, Art. 31, that going about to prescribe a means to end debates, which might arise upon any point of *Doctrine or Discipline*, &c. they ordain, first the Consistory shall endeavour to appease the whole without noise, and with all the sweetness of the word of God; and after having established a consistory, a conference, and a provincial synod, as so many different degrees of jurisdiction, coming at last to a national synod, above which, amongst them, there is no authority, they speak of it in these terms; *There the entire and final resolution shall be given by the word of*
F 6 God,

God, to which if they refuse to acquiesce in every point, and with an express disavowing of their errors, they shall be cut off from the Church. It is manifest the gentlemen of the pretended Reformation do not attribute the authority of this last Sentence to the word of God taken in itself, and independently of the interpretation of the Church; for tho' this word was made use of in their first judgments, yet, notwithstanding, they permitted an appeal. It is then this word, as interpreted by the sovereign tribunal of the Church, which gives *this final resolution, to which whosoever refuses to submit in every point*, altho' he boasts he is authorized by the word of God, is no more reputed but as a prophane person who corrupts and abuses it.

BUT the form of those letters of deputation which were addressed to the synod of Vitre in the year 1517, to be observed by the provinces, when they were to send their deputies to a national synod, has yet something more express; it is in these terms: *We promise before God to submit ourselves to all that shall be concluded and resolved of in your holy assemblies, to obey them, and put them in execution to our utmost power, being persuaded, as we are, that God will preside in it, and lead you by his holy spirit into all truth and equity, by the rule of his word.* Here the point is not about receiving the resolution of a synod, after they have found it to speak according to Scripture; they

they submit to it there, even before it is assembled; and they do it, because they are persuaded *the Holy Ghost will preside in it*. If this persuasion be only founded upon a human presumption, can a man in conscience promise before God to submit to all that shall be there concluded and resolved of; to obey and execute them to the utmost of his power? And if this persuasion has its foundation in a certain belief of the assistance which the Holy Ghost gives to the Church in her final decisions, Catholics themselves require no more. So that the proceedings of our adversaries shew them to agree with us in this supreme authority, without which it is impossible ever to put an end to any difficulty in religion; and tho', whilst they were desirous to cast off the yoke of obedience, they denied the faithful to be obliged to submit their judgments to that of the Church, yet the necessity of establishing an order, has since forced them to grant what their first undertakings had made them deny.

THEY have gone yet much farther in the national synod held at *St. Foy* in the year 1578. There was some overture made of a reconcilment with the *Lutherans*, by means of a general form of a profession of Faith common to all their Churches, which was proposed to be drawn up. Those of this kingdom (*France*) were invited to send to an assembly, which was to be held upon this account,

Virtuous

134 *Authority of the Church*

Virtuous persons, authorised by all the said Churches, with an ample procuration, to treat, agree upon, and decide all points of Doctrine, and other matters concerning that union. Upon this proposal, see in what terms the resolution of the synod of St. Foy was couched. The national synod of this kingdom, after having given God thanks for such an overture, and commended the care, diligence, and good advice of the forementioned persons convoked, and approving the remedies which they have suggested; that is to say, principally that of framing a new Confession of Faith, and of giving power to some certain persons to compose it, has ordained, That if the copy of the above named Confession of Faith be sent in time, it shall be examined in each provincial synod, or otherwise, according to the convenience of each province; and in the mean time has deputed four Ministers, the most experienced in those affairs, to whom express charge has been given to be present at the place and day appointed, with the letters and full procurations of all the Ministers and Elders, Deputies of the provinces of this kingdom, as also of the Lord Viscount Turenne, to do all things abovesaid; yea, even in case that means could not be found out to examine in every province the said confession, it should be referred to their prudence and sound judgment to agree and conclude all the points which shall be brought into deliberation, as well for Doctrine, as for other matters concerning the benefit,
union,

union, and peace of all the Churches. It was to this, in fine, that this seeming tenderness of conscience of these pretended Reformers tended. How often have they reproached to us, as a weakness, that submission which we pay to the decisions of the Church, which, say they, is nothing else but a company of men liable to error; and yet, nevertheless, being assembled in a body in a national synod, which represented all the Churches of the pretended Reformed in *France*, they are not afraid, by mutual consent, to leave their faith to the arbitration of four men, with so absolute an abandoning of their own sentiments, that they gave them full power to change the very Confession of Faith itself, which they do at this very day propose to the whole Christian world, as a Confession of Faith which contains nothing but the pure word of God, and for which, as they said in presenting it to our kings, an infinite number of people were ready to shed their blood. I leave the prudent reader to make his reflections upon the decree of this synod; and shall, in a few words, finish the Explication of the Church's Tenets.

SECT;

S E C T. XXI.

The Authority of the holy See of Rome, and of Episcopacy.

THE son of God, being desirous his Church should be one, and solidly built upon unity, hath established and instituted the primacy of St. *Peter* to maintain and cement it. Upon which account, we acknowledge this primacy in the Successors of the prince of the Apostles, to whom, for this cause, we owe that obedience and submission which the holy Councils and Fathers have always taught the faithful.

As for those things which we know are disputed of in the schools, tho' the Ministers continually alledge them to render this power odious, it is not necessary we speak of them here, seeing they are not articles of the Catholic Faith. It is sufficient we acknowledge a Head, established by God, to conduct his whole flock in his paths; which those who love concord amongst brethren, and ecclesiastical unanimity, will most willingly acknowledge.

AND certainly if the authors of the pretended Reformation had loved Unity, they would neither have abolished episcopal government, which was established by JESUS CHRIST himself, and which we find in force even in the times of the Apostles; nor have despised

Conclusion of this Treatise. 13

despised the authority of St. Peter's chair, which has so solid a foundation in the Gospel, and so evident a succession in tradition; but they would rather have carefully preserved episcopal authority, which establishes unity in particular Churches, and the primacy of St. Peter's chair, which is the common center of all Catholic Unity.

S E C T. XXII.

Conclusion of this Treatise.

THIS is the Exposition of the Catholic Doctrine, in which, that I might tie myself to the most principal, I have left some questions untouched, which the gentlemen of the pretended Reformed Religion, do not look upon as lawful matter for a separation. I hope those of their communion, who shall impartially examine all the parts of this treatise, will be better disposed by the reading of it, to give ear to those proofs upon which the faith of the Church is established, and will in the mean time acknowledge many of our controversies may be ended by a sincere explication of our tenets; that her Doctrine is Holy, and that, according to their own principles, no one of her articles destroys the grounds of salvation.

If any one should think fit to answer this Treatise, he is desired to consider, that to accomplish

138 *Conclusion of this Treatise.*

accomplish his intent, he must not undertake to refute the Doctrine contained in it, seeing my design was only to propose it, without going about to prove it; and that if in some places I have hinted at some of the reasons which establish it, it is because the knowledge of the principal reasons of a Doctrine, is often a necessary part of it's Explication.

It would also be quitting of the design of this Treatise, to examine the different methods which Catholic Divines make use of to establish or explicate the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*, and the different consequences which particular Doctors have drawn from it. To urge any thing solid against this Treatise, and which may come home to the point, it must be proved that the Church's faith is not here faithfully expounded, and that by acts which the same Church has obliged herself to receive; or else it must be shewn, that this Explication leaves all the objections in their full force, and all the disputes untouched; or, in fine, it must be precisely shewn in what this Doctrine subverts the foundations of Faith.

The End of the Exposition.



The Brief of our holy Father

Pope INNOCENT the Eleventh.

VENERABLE brother, health and apostolical benediction. Your book of the *Exposition of Catholic Faith*, lately presented to us, contains such Doctrine, and is composed in such a method, and with so much prudence, that it is thereby rendred proper to instruct the readers clearly in few words, and to extort, even from the unwilling, a Confession of the Catholic faith. For which reasons we do not only think it worthy our commendation, but also to be read and esteemed by all. We hope this work, by the grace of God, will bring forth much fruit, and will not a little help to propagate the orthodox faith, which is our continual care and principal solicitude. And, in the interim, we are more and more confirmed in that good opinion we have always had of your virtue and piety, and we feel an increase of those hopes which we had long since formed in ourselves, of the education of the Dauphin of *France*, and that he, who is entrusted to your care, and endowed with inclinations worthy the King his father and all his ancestors, will receive

ceive from you those instructions which are proper to the son of a most Christian King, whose birth entitles him both to so flourishing a kingdom, and at the same time to be a protector of the Catholic Religion. And this King, who has chosen you amongst so many great men, with which *France* flourishes at this time, to so great a province, as is the laying the foundations of a public happiness, will no doubt receive an eternal glory from the good success of your care, according to that oracle of Scripture, which tells us, *That a wise son is the glory of his father.* Continue then to go forwards chearfully in so important a work, especially since you have before your eyes such mighty fruits of your industry. For we hear, and that from all parts, and we cannot but feel an excess of joy and consolation, amidst our many troubles, when we hear how this young Prince is carried on to virtue with a noble fervour, and daily gives new testimonies of prudence and piety. This we can assure you, that nothing is capable of endearing our paternal affection to you more, than thus to employ your utmost care to inspire into this young King's mind those maxims which make a mighty King; that in a riper age, being happy and victorious, like the King his father, he may regulate by holy laws, and reduce to Christian manners, barbarous nations, and enemies to name of Christian, as we hope to see them shortly subdued to the empire

empire of this great king, since peace being restored to Europe, he has so fair an opportunity to transfer his victorious arms into the East. To conclude, assure yourself the submission and respect which your letters shew you to have towards the Apostolic See, and us, who now possess it, tho' unworthy, for the government of the Catholic Church, find in us a mutual affection; the testimonies of which you shall perceive, when any occasion shall present itself. With a sincere affection we give you our apostolic benediction. Given at *Rome* at *St. Peter's*, under the fisher's ring, the 4th of January 1679, the third year of our Popedom. Signed *Marius Spinula*, and on the top; *To our venerable brother, James Bishop of Condom.*

The Approbation of my Lords the Archbishops and Bishops.

WE have read the *Treatise* entitled, *An Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church in matters of controversy*, composed by *M. James Benigne Bossuet*, Bishop and Lord of *Condom*, preceptor to my Lord the Dauphin; and we declare, That after having examined it with as much application as the importance of the matter required, we have found the *Doctrine* contained in it conformable

firmable to the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman faith: And therefore we think ourselves obliged to propose it as such to those whom God has committed to our charge. We are certain the faithful will be edified by it, and we hope those of the pretended Reformed Religion, who read this work with attention, will receive from it so right an understanding as may conduce to put them into the way of salvation.

CHARLES MAURICE LE TELLIER *Archbishop and Duke of Rheims.*

CH. DE ROSMEDEC *Archbishop of Tours.*

FELIX, *Bishop and Earl of Chalons.*

DE GRIGNAN, *Bishop of Uzes.*

D. DE LIGNY, *Bishop of Meaux.*

NICHOLAS, *Bishop of Auxerre.*

GABRIEL, *Bishop of Autun.*

MARK, *Bishop of Tarbe.*

ARMAND JOHN *Bishop of Beziers.*

STEPHEN, *Bishop and Prince of Grenoble.*

JULIUS, *Bishop of Tule.*

8 DE 59

A



A TABLE of ARTICLES

CONTAINED

In this TREATISE.

I.	THE design of this Treatise.	Page 47
II.	Those of the pretended Reformed Religion acknowledge, That the Catholic Church embraces all the fundamental articles of the Christian Religion.	49
III.	Religious Worship is terminated in God alone.	53
IV.	Invocation of Saints.	55
V.	Images and Relics.	62
VI.	Justification.	67
VII.	The Merit of Good Works.	69
VIII.	Satisfactions, Purgatory and Indulgences.	74
IX.	The Sacraments.	80
	Baptism.	81
	Confirmation.	82
	Penance and Sacramental Confession.	ibid.
	Extreme Unction.	84
	Marriage.	ibid.
	Orders.	85

Doctrine

- X. *Doctrine of the Church touching the Real Presence of the body and blood of JESUS CHRIST in the Eucharist, and the manner how the Church understands these words, This is my body.* Page 85
- XI. *Exposition of these words, Do this in remembrance of me.* 90
- XII. *Exposition of the Calvinists Doctrine concerning the Real Presence.* 94
- XIII. *Of Transubstantiation and Adoration, and in what sense the Eucharist is a sign.* 106
- XIV. *The Sacrifice of the Mass.* 108
- XV. *The Epistle to the Hebrews.* 112
- XVI. *Reflections upon the preceding Doctrine.* 116
- XVII. *Communion under both kinds* 120
- XVIII. *The written and unwritten word.* 123
- XIX. *The Authority of the Church.* 124
- XX. *The sentiments of those of the pretended Reformed Religion, concerning the Authority of the Church.* 128
- XXI. *The Authority of the holy See of Rome, and of Episcopacy.* 136
- XXII. *The Conclusion of this Treatise.* 137

F I N I S.

18 DE 59



